



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 027 790 794

306 Journal of social sciences.
A5127,
no.28

ANNEX

1891

SAL

306 A5127 no.28



STANFORD·UNIVERSITY·LIBRARY

306
A5127

78

74-28

Stanford Library

MAR 3 1921

C. R.

JOURNAL

OF

SOCIAL SCIENCE

OCTOBER, 1891

PAPERS ON LABOR ORGANIZATION, ETC.

PUBLISHED FOR THE

AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

DAMRELL & UPHAM, BOSTON, AND G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK

1891

PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.

Journal of Social Science. Containing the Transactions of the American Association. Nos. I-V, 8vo, paper, each \$1.50. Nos. VI-XXVIII, each \$1.00.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWO.—Current Record of the Association. I. Immigration—Frederick Kapp. II. The American Census—James A. Garfield. III. The Mode of Procedure in Cases of Contested Elections—Henry L. Dawes. IV. The Public Charities of the State of New York—Theodore W. Dwight. V. The Public Libraries of the United States—Ainsworth R. Spofford. VI. The Science of Transportation—Joseph D. Potts. VII. Vaccination—A Report presented by Francis Bacon, William A. Hammond, and David F. Lincoln. VIII. The Election of Presidents—Charles Francis Adams, Jr. IX. Life Insurance—Sheppard Homans. X. The Administration of Criminal Justice—George C. Barrett. XI. Health Laws and their Administration—Elisha Harris. XII. An International Code—D. D. Field. XIII. General Intelligence. XIV. Constitution. XV. List of New Members. XVI. List of Works relating to Social Science published in 1899.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER THREE.—I. Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns—F. L. Olmsted. II. Art Education in America—C. C. Perkins. III. Civilization and Health—Francis Bacon. IV. American System of Patents—S. A. Duncan. V. Nature and Sphere of Police Power—T. D. Woolsey. VI. Legislation and Social Science—E. L. Godkin. VII. Representation of Minorities—D. D. Field. VIII. Relations of Business Men to National Legislation—H. A. Hill. IX. Houses in the Country for Working Men—G. B. Emerson. X. Minority Representation in Europe—Thomas Hare. XI. Application of Mr. Hare's System of Voting to the Nomination of Overseers of Harvard College—W. R. Ware. XII. General Intelligence. 1. Home. 2. Foreign.

NUMBER FOUR is out of print, as well as **NUMBERS ONE, THREE, EIGHT, and NINE.**

CONTENTS OF NUMBER FIVE.—I. Municipal Government—Dorman B. Eaton. II. Higher Education of Women—T. W. Higginson. III. Restoration of the Currency—Joseph S. Ropes. IV. Some Results of the Census—Francis A. Walker. V. Public Vaccination—F. P. Foster. VI. The International—David A. Wasson. VII. Legislation in Relation to Pharmacy—G. F. H. Markoe. VIII. General Intelligence.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER SIX.—General Meeting at New York. I. Opening Address—George William Curtis. II. The Work of Social Science in the United States—F. B. Sanborn. III. Financial Administration—G. Bradford. IV. Conference of the Boards of Public Charities. V. Pauperism in the City of New York. VI. The Farmers' Movement in the Western States—Willard C. Flagg. VII. Ocean Lanes for Steamship Navigation—Prof. B. Peirce. VIII. Rational Principles of Taxation—David A. Wells. IX. American Railroads—Gardner G. Hubbard. X. Reformation of Prisoners—Z. R. Brockway. XI. The Deaf-mute College at Washington—Edward M. Gallaudet. XII. The Protection of Animals—George T. Angell. XIII. American Finance—Prof. W. G. Sumner.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER SEVEN.—I. Private Property upon the Sea—Rev. Dr. Woolsey. II. Conference of Boards of Health. III. (School Hygiene)—Drs. D. F. Lincoln and A. L. Carroll. IV. Tent Hospitals—Dr. J. F. Jenkins. V. National, State, and Sectarian Universities—A. D. White and Dr. McCosh. VI. Free Lending Libraries—W. W. Greenough. VII. The Young Men's Christian Association—Cephas Brainard. VIII. Ocean Lanes. IX. Prison Reform in Europe and America—Dr. Wines and F. B. Sanborn. X. Social Science Record. XI. Conference of Boards of Charities.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER EIGHT.—I. The Production and Distribution of Wealth—David A. Wells. II. The Work of Social Science—F. B. Sanborn. III. Progress in International Law—J. B. Angell. IV. The Experiment of Civil Service Reform—Dorman B. Eaton. V. The Treatment of the Guilty—W. G. Eliot. VI. Health in Schools—Drs. D. F. Lincoln, J. J. Putnam, etc. VII. Financial Policy of England and the United States—G. Bradford. VIII. Limitations of Judicial Power—Emory Washburn. IX. Life Insurance for the Poor—Elihu Wright and Sheppard Homans. X. Legal Education—W. G. Hammond. XI. The Detroit Meeting.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER NINE.—I. Social Science in Theory and Practice—F. B. Sanborn. II. The Silver Question—W. Stanley Jevons. III. The Silver Question—B. F. Nourse. IV. Savings Banks—John P. Townsend. V. Local Taxation—William Minot, Jr. VI. Industrial and Social Aspects of the Southern Question—W. L. Trenholm. VII. Education in the Southern States—T. M. Logan. VIII. The Navigation Laws of Great Britain and the United States—Hamilton A. Hill. IX. The Tariff Question—Horace White. X. Custom House Forms—Henry D. Hyde. XI. State and Municipal Government—Samuel Bowles. XII. Municipal Economy—Daniel L. Harris.

INSTRUCTION IN SOCIAL SCIENCE.

OPENING ADDRESS AT THE GENERAL MEETING OF 1896.

BY ANDREW D. WHITE, PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION.

A quarter of a century has now passed since the founding of the American Social Science Association. It was organized so modestly that very few people knew of it during the first three years of its existence; but those years were used with good effect, and its Albany meeting, in 1869, seemed to all of us who were present a remarkable success. Very vividly do I recall that gathering at Albany, when Henry Villard presented his view of the scope of the society, and Horace Greeley proposed his plan for popularizing its results. The public at large seemed indifferent: it is quite likely that the name *Social Science* created distrust.

May I be pardoned for a purely personal reminiscence? I give it because it serves to prove that this want of effect among the people was rather apparent than real, and to show how such an Association as ours is likely to affect the country at large.

Perhaps no one had more reason to listen intently to the papers read at this session than I had. During the four previous years, as a member of the Senate of the State of New York, I had had frequent occasion to regret want of knowledge in various departments of Social Science, not only in myself, but in most, if not in all, of my colleagues. As a member of the Committee on Municipal Affairs in that body, I was called to look carefully into the organization of various institutions,—charitable, penal, and educational; and in open Senate I had not unfrequently to take part in earnest discussion regarding the establishment and maintenance of such institutions, intended to meet the needs of a State embracing not far from five millions of inhabitants.

It had fallen to my lot to introduce a bill codifying the laws relating to public schools in the State, a bill for the incorporation of Cornell University,—an institution which was to embrace provision for instruction in applied science, then almost an entire novelty,—and to have much to do with the establishment of the Willard Asylum for the insane, which was to become by far the largest in the State, and one of the most important in the world.

337113

By each of these measures I was led through unaccustomed fields, and over seas of doubt, upon which there was little to guide. Frequently, indeed, there was neither chart nor compass.

This experience showed me that in the establishment and maintenance of such institutions, while injury is frequently done by local, political, or sectarian bias on the part of legislators, the greatest injury, after all, is generally wrought by their ignorance of fundamental theory and of approved practice.

It was in view of this experience that I welcomed the early meetings of this Association. The papers read by Henry Villard, Goldwin Smith, and others who then came together in the little room at Albany, threw a new light upon the whole subject. Therefore it was that, at a very early day in the history of Cornell University, I urged my fellow-Trustees to establish a department, or at least a lectureship, which should do something toward training up young men for future usefulness in these fields, giving them a better knowledge of such subjects than legislators generally possess. My hope was that some of these young men, during their after career,—in the pulpit, through the press, on boards of educational and charitable institutions, Village Boards, County Boards, in City Councils, State and National Legislatures,—would turn their knowledge thus acquired to good account as regards the development and maintenance of State and local institutions for charity, correction, and education.

As soon as the funds of Cornell University permitted, this plan was carried out; and Mr. F. B. Sanborn, the first Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Charities, was called to give the instruction required. In sketching out my plan to Mr. Sanborn, I had suggested, first, courses of lectures which should acquaint students with the problems to be solved, and with the best solutions of them yet obtained at home and abroad; and, next, I proposed that there should be something analogous to laboratory practice,—that is, that, under the guidance of the Professor, the students should visit the local and State institutions, especially those of a penal and charitable character, study them with care, report upon them, and discuss their reports in the class-room. Such investigation, study, report, and discussion would, I thought, interest them in such subjects, would lead them to observe carefully, to think upon their observations correctly, to discuss them earnestly, and to treasure up the fruit of such observation, thought, and discussion for after use. The result did not disappoint me. I need

hardly say that Professor Sanborn improved upon my crude suggestions, developed them fruitfully, builded far better than I knew, and made the instruction a thorough success. A large class of thoughtful young men came to his lectures. Cornell University is fortunately situated as regards the practical study of the problems involved; it was easy for his classes to visit with him, not only such local institutions as the neighboring County Jail and County Poorhouse, but also a large number of State institutions in the vicinity of the University, among them the State Prison at Auburn, the Penitentiary at Syracuse, the State Reformatory at Elmira, the House of Refuge (now the Industrial School) at Rochester, and the State Asylums for the insane at Utica and Ovid. The reports made and the discussions held on these were admirable.

The coming into the University Law Faculty of Professor Collin, so well known by his admirable work at the Elmira Reformatory, and so thoroughly equipped by his connection with State legislation at Albany, led to his appointment to the position formerly held by Professor Sanborn; and the instruction is still going on with results calculated to inspire hope in every well-wisher of our race.

This simple statement is made because it indicates, better than an elaborate argument can do, what part our leading Universities and Colleges can take in the evolution of Social Science, and especially in its relations to penal and charitable work. The whole result of this experiment strengthens my hope that men thus trained in the Universities of the various States may go forth into positions of influence, and especially into our legislative bodies, local, State, and National, to improve our old charitable and penal institutions and methods, and organize new ones.

But Cornell University has not been alone in this matter. Other institutions have given attention to the subject, and from time to time at the sessions of this Association we have had accounts of their work. Very noteworthy are the reports of Mr. Sanborn in various years, and especially in 1885, and of Mrs. Talbot in 1886. Among the men and institutions taking the lead in this noble work are Professors Perry at Williams, Dunster and Vaughn at the University of Michigan, F. G. Peabody at Harvard, James at the University of Pennsylvania, Scovel at Wooster, Dike at Andover, besides various others at Columbia, the University of Wisconsin, Wellesley, Vassar, and Bryn Mawr Colleges.

Undoubtedly, the most noteworthy contribution to the whole subject is the report on methods of education in Social Science, made to this Association in 1886 by a special committee,—Professor James of the University of Pennsylvania, Professor Harris, now Commissioner of Education, and Professor Sanborn of Cornell. No more suggestive document has appeared in this country, and it ought to be brought to the notice of every College and University governing board and faculty in the country. More than that, it ought to be brought to the attention of public-spirited individuals, to show them how rich a field lies before us for cultivation in the interest of humanity.

Still another important document is Mr. Sanborn's Syllabus of Lectures before the Medical School of Boston University, published by this Association in 1886. This document, more special than the other, but hardly less important, should also be brought out of our archives, republished, circulated, and made the basis of University work.

What should this work be? There is no time in an address of this kind to treat such a subject exhaustively. All that I can do is to touch on certain salient points and give a few typical facts.

The field of this Association was divided in its early days between four, and soon after five, departments: *first*, Education; *second*, Health; *third*, Trade and Finance; *fourth*, Social Economy; *fifth*, Jurisprudence. Each of these, of course, has in it germs which require to be developed by specialists, apart from the more general work of a Social Science Association. This will be more especially seen with the third department, that of Trade and Finance, and the fifth, that of Jurisprudence, in which schools of Political Economy and Law are an absolute necessity. Still, that connection with special departments by no means takes them out of the wider field of Social Science.

Let us run very briefly through these five departments. The first, that of Education, presents a vast field; and, while it demands a special department of Pedagogy, or the science and art of teaching, such as is now established at some of our Universities, notably at the Universities of Michigan and Cornell, and the new Clark University at Worcester, still there are always problems of general interest to be studied by an Association like this. In no other department, probably, has so great a revolution been wrought during the existence of this Association. I choose the word "revolution" designedly, for the history of the higher educa-

tion in this country during the last twenty-five years shows far more than ordinary progress: it shows a distinct revolution, and with most happy results. To stimulate and direct this great change, this Association has done much. Scattered through its reports are such addresses and papers as those of President Eliot, President Gilman, Dr. J. M. Gregory, Dr. W. T. Harris, Mrs. Talbot, Miss Simcox, President Walker, Miss Lumsden of Scotland, and others, who have led the way toward the present better condition of things.

Yet, while the higher education has been so transformed in this country, it is a question whether the intermediate and primary education has been advanced in at all the same proportion. In my opinion, it has not been. Many questions regarding it remain to be developed by discussions like ours. As one of these, I would name public instruction in morals. Our archives show many admirable papers bearing on this. That by Professor (now President) Stanley Hall, on "The Moral and Religious Training of Children," published by this Association in 1882, may be taken as a type of a class of papers likely to be of great value. This subject should never be lost sight of in an Association of this kind. More and more our people are finding out that the development of the intellect without the strengthening of the moral sense is but labor and sorrow. Any one who knows anything about the history of the building up of Germany after it was crushed by Napoleon, and the part which Kant's "Critique of the Practical Reason" and Fichte's "Discourses to the German Nation" had in this upbuilding, knows what the value of moral training in Universities and schools may be. At this moment there is nothing, probably, so really helpful to France as the work of Paul Janet, and others like him, in bringing the Kantian Ethics to bear upon the children and youth of his country. Such labors as those of President Porter and Mrs. Corson to bring Janet's health-giving ideas to bear on this country should be supplemented by papers at our meetings.

Take, next, the department of Health: here, too, the Association has much to be proud of. Its published Proceedings show a long list of papers from the most eminent authorities of this country. Still, the facts and ideas brought out in these papers have not yet been brought to bear upon the people at large, or, indeed, upon the thinking leaders and teachers of the people.

May I be indulged here in another piece of personal reminis-

cence, which I make simply as suggesting something of possible use to others, and as presenting my view in concrete form? While occupied with the organization of Cornell University, I read for the first time Herbert Spencer's Treatise on Education. Nothing struck me so much in it as his argument upon the value to students of the study of Human Physiology. Under the influence of his reasoning, I secured at the opening of Cornell University, through the co-operation of Professor Agassiz, a Professor of Comparative Anatomy and Physiology, who was not only an original investigator, but an admirable lecturer. I insisted that we should depart from the custom, at that time common in our larger institutions of learning, of relegating this subject, as an optional matter, to a few lectures given in the Senior year by some physician called upon for the purpose; and that all students, near the beginning of their course, should attend and pass examinations upon a thorough course of lectures on this subject of Human Physiology,—a course to be illustrated by the best appliances obtainable in Europe and America.

The results surpassed my most sanguine hopes. Not only have four thousand young men and women gone forth with a fair practical knowledge on this subject, but a considerable number have been led to fit themselves carefully for physiological investigation. I point out this experience as an example of the way in which ideas, struck out by theorists, may be practically brought to bear on our system of public instruction.

Thirdly, Trade and Finance: here, too, the Association has done much. A list which includes such names as President Walker, Henry C. Carey, Professors Sumner and Perry, David A. Wells, George Walker, Edward Atkinson, Horace White, Bonamy Price, John P. Townsend, E. J. James, and so many of their comrades, is indeed one to be proud of. But there is room for one feature which I think might be helpful. I would suggest that, in future, efforts be especially made to secure papers, not only from such gentlemen as those I have mentioned, but also from men in active contact with the greater lines of business in the country, and especially with the management of banks, railways, express companies, forwarding companies, insurance companies, and the like. In saying this, I do not at all discourage the presentation of theory. Take as a typical example of what may be done, and has constantly been done by our Association, the recent history of the inflation mania in the United States. I firmly believe that the

presence in our National Legislature of men trained in a knowledge of the best theories on these subjects — men like Garfield, Bayard, Sherman, Morrill, Edmunds, Hawley, Gibson, and others of their sort — was the main agency in saving us, in 1874, from a catastrophe in which not only the national prosperity, but the national honor, would have been wrecked.

Very many other subjects naturally occur in this and kindred fields. Such simple but powerful teaching regarding ownership in land as that recently put forth by Dr. William T. Harris is of immense value. In fact, this whole question needs to be thoroughly presented again and again by our Association, in order that men may be trained to deal conclusively with the specious theories and brilliant arguments of erratic men of genius.

Just here, indeed, an objection will begin to arise in the minds of many. It will be said that instruction of this kind will be likely to create *doctrinaires*. It may create some, but I believe that its result will be to cripple demagogues on one side and *doctrinaires* on the other. It is an interesting fact that the school of young political and social economists now arising is the very school which is declaring against doctrinairism in this country. That we suffer greatly from doctrinairism, and have always so suffered, from the days of Thomas Jefferson until now, is undoubtedly true; but the main sign of help on the horizon is seen in the efforts of just this school of the younger men who have had the most thorough instruction. Here, indeed, comes in a subject which would be most fruitful, and which cannot be too frequently brought into the discussion of Associations like this,—the proper limitations of *laissez faire*.

Fourth, Social Economy: in this field the first quarter of a century in the history of the Association has been especially fruitful. The high standard set by Dr. S. G. Howe, Carroll D. Wright, Charles Loring Brace, Elizur Wright, Frederick Law Olmsted, Professor Johnson, Josiah Quincy, Robert Treat Paine, the Rev. Dr. Wayland, and others has been felt from first to last. Yet the old questions and many new ones will confront us during the next quarter of a century at least. One of these I select because, while it seems one of the most trivial, it is perhaps one of the most far-reaching,—a question in household economy, regarding “hired help.” It is rapidly becoming one of the burning questions of this country. There is no doubt that in the poorest peasant cabin of England, France, and Germany the mother of the

household has better and more efficient help through household crises than have the wives of vast numbers of American farmers, mechanics, and merchants, who live in most comfortable houses and seem in every way prosperous. There is no doubt that this very want of suitable aid has broken down the constitutions of vast numbers of American women, destroyed multitudes of households, filled lunatic asylums, forced men of light and leading to leave influential positions in the rural districts for insignificant positions in the cities, and has done much to check the birth and growth of that part of the population on which the best hopes of the future depend.

So, too, take in this field another subject rarely thought upon,—provision for places of popular recreation. The development given to athletic exercises, the generous efforts made for seaside excursions of the poor of great cities, and the like, and the establishment of public parks at some of the larger aggregations of humanity in our country are in every way encouraging. But, after all, much needs to be done. It is very difficult to make the average city Councilman see the importance of public parks. In an interior city of this State, embracing 100,000 inhabitants, the noble gift of a public park has recently been allowed by the Common Council to be jeopardized, and possibly to be lost, by the non-fulfilment of the very easy conditions on which the gift was made. Such papers as that of Mr. Olmsted on this topic should be brought to bear on the popular mind through the University and the press.

Another subject, which, though it may appear technical, has so many bearings upon social welfare that it well deserves discussion in the future meetings of the Association, is that of Public Roads. On this subject, with the exception of sundry pungent statements by Mr. Olmsted, we have thus far presented little or nothing. As a matter of fact, our roads are the worst in the civilized world. The Governors of two of our largest States, as well as sundry Conventions, have called attention to this condition of things. During the past winter many localities in the State of New York were virtually cut off from each other and from the world by the condition of the highways. Nor was this the case merely in the rural districts: it was the case in many of the cities. I can name a city of 12,000 inhabitants which was almost entirely cut off from a railway station by the condition of the street leading to it. Here, too, the people perish for want of knowledge. Other republics,

far less advanced in wealth than ours,—Switzerland, for example,—have made magnificent roads under far greater difficulties than any we have to meet; and governments which Americans are accustomed to despise are entitled to look down on us with contempt in this respect,—as, for example, the old governments of Naples, of the Papal States, of the various little German Principalities, and others.

And, finally, in the field of Jurisprudence the past of the Association gives promise of a noble future. The names of Tilden, of Washburn, of Francis Wayland, of Chamberlain, Baldwin, Hammond, and many others, come at once to our minds. But much remains. Take, first, a simple question regarding crime. Perhaps the weakest spot in the general course of our public affairs is the administration of criminal law. I am well aware that the law itself, especially in this State, has, within the last twenty-five years, been greatly amended. Still, its administration is, on the whole, anything but satisfactory. This side of Spain, Southern Italy, and Greece, we shall probably find no such frequent defeats of justice in Christendom. Professor Stanley Hall, in his paper above referred to, speaks of the imperfect administration of criminal law as a natural vice in republics; but instruction ought to mitigate this vice, and in time to remove it. Certain it is that it seems now approaching its height. Punishment for the highest crimes is so long delayed by the most contemptible chicanery that its proper effect on those inclined to crime is almost entirely lost. Why is it that such a state of things is allowed to continue? Why is it that there is constant demoralization at the sight of criminals triumphant? The reason is very simple. Our people, even the leaders of the people, have but a faint conception of the importance of the subject, and next to no conception at all of the best dealing with it. Hence it is that we see the people laud and magnify the skillful criminal attorney, who is in this matter their worst enemy,—the attorney whose chicanery turns loose on them the most dangerous criminals to prey upon them and upon their children. There is in all our great cities, and indeed in our country at large, a great class of professional criminals. They are, as a rule, recognized. Their profession is known to be crime, as the profession of Mr. Vanderbilt is known to be railroad management, that of Mr. Potter Palmer the selling of dry goods, that of Mr. Evarts the law, and that of Dr. Phillips Brooks the ministry. Why is it, then, that these professional criminals are left loose to prey on us?

Simply because the public are unaware of the real cause of the difficulty, and their legislators are fettered by certain superstitions in law, survivals of arrangements adopted many centuries ago to protect peaceable citizens from tyrannical kings or greedy barons. The presumptions, methods, and machinery of the common law, which protected honest men in the Fourteenth Century, protect criminals in the Nineteenth. More and more the truth should be spread among the people that the real enemy of the citizen to-day is not King John nor even King George, but the professional criminal, the ballot-box stuffer, the chronic ruffian, the maker of drunkards, and that legal superstitions and fictions should no longer protect these.

So much for legislation. Then, too, thinking men and the people at large should be shown that, in the administration of the law, honor is due to members of the legal profession who sternly endeavor to root out crime, and not to those who protect crime. More than that, the people should be made to see that the function of prosecuting attorney is really important; that it should not be thrown over as part of the spoils of a political campaign, to be scrambled for by unfledged lawyers, but should be given to lawyers of eminence; and that, to make it desirable, the salary should be such that leading men in the profession will seek it and prize it.

In our Proceedings for 1886 will be found a paper entitled "How to deal with Habitual Criminals," by Professor S. E. Baldwin, of Yale. Nothing can be better, either in matter or manner. He shows how, to use his own words, "our prisons are becoming boarding-schools for the young criminals, and shelters for the aged criminals." He points out the fact that the habitual criminal is "a perpetual drain on the community by day and night." He gives an interesting study in Comparative Legislation, as he shows what has been proposed in different countries and States to improve this evil, and then offers a solution of his own which is worthy of the closest attention.

Surely, the fact that so eminent a legislator and advocate of popular rights as Edward Livingston was ready to develop the most extreme doctrine known in the Habitual Criminals' Act is evidence that there is no real danger to well-ordered liberty in evolving out of our present miserable condition in this respect something better; and some recent legislation of the State of New York seems to show that Livingston's principles in regard to dealings with habitual criminals are on the way to more general acceptance.

Take next the prevalence of crimes of violence, and the inadequacy of our laws in dealing with them. An eminent judge once said to me, "The taking of life by due process of law, as a penalty for the greatest crimes, seems the only way of taking life to which the average American has any objection." The judge was right. There is throughout this republic a wide-spread superstition favoring the protection of criminals. Safeguards useful in the Middle Ages to protect citizens against kings, feudal lords, and robber knights, are now used to protect even murderers. By the efforts of Associations like this, and by the agency of such popularization of their discussions as I advocate, there should be a quiet evolution out of this superstition,—an evolution of better ideas, taking form in better laws,—laws promoting more prompt, more efficient, more common-sense dealings with criminals, and especially with professional criminals. We have all heard the platitudes confounding crime with misfortune. To meet these, there should be developed more healthful modes of thought,—the idea that crime is not mere misfortune, that crime is crime, and that the criminal is a criminal. There should be developed a healthy, manly, womanly determination, while aiding to uplift those who have casually fallen into crime, to fight professional or habitual criminals, to exterminate them. The passion for fishing and hunting is doubtless a survival of the earliest instincts of the human race. Let this survival be made to take better forms. My hope is that such agencies as these I advocate may send forth many of our best trained young men to fish for plunderers, to hunt for scoundrels, vigorously, mercilessly. I trust that, through the popularization of proper ideas in the way indicated, we shall by and by have a prevailing sentiment that the most inglorious thing a man can do is to prostitute his talents in aiding crime and criminals, and that one of the most glorious things he can do is to prove his manliness by fighting on the side of justice and order.

Take next certain wide-spread but false notions regarding the Judicial Function. Much has been done already in this State to bring back the higher Judiciary to the position it held in earlier days. In 1847 there was an outburst of *doctrinaire* folly in the State. State judgeships were generally made elective, with short terms, small pay, and poor accommodations. Of late years there has been a change to a better system: judges have been given longer terms, larger salaries, better accommodations, and dignified surroundings. As to the highest State Court, certain simple bar-

riers between it and persons contending before it have been replaced. They are barriers which were originally evolved out of the common sense of mankind,—that common sense which brought men to know that mankind is largely led by the imagination, and that, when judges are sitting in court, everything that surrounds them, including even the garb they wear, should aid them to maintain the judicial attitude and enforce the judicial relation toward all present. They were barriers which the wisdom of our forefathers erected, which the unwisdom of our fathers tore away, and which the wisdom of the present generation has restored.

We have great reason, indeed, to congratulate ourselves that our courts are as good as they are. The Supreme Court of this nation is indeed its brightest jewel. It seems to have been created by our fathers in a moment of divine inspiration. The subordinate federal courts are also excellent. Our State courts are most of them good ; but, after all, there is nothing more necessary, in order to keep our judiciary, and, above all, our elective judiciary, what it ought to be than the evolution in the people of a higher sense of the Judicial Function. More and more, Associations like this, and the higher schools of Social Science, such as those which I have suggested, should assist the growth in the popular mind of the truth that a cheap judiciary is the most costly luxury which a people can indulge in ; that it is folly for the people at large to pay starvation stipends to judges who protect their highest interests, while millionaires and corporations can employ legal gentlemen who have proved their right to demand fees equal to a king's ransom. Instruction in our Universities, and short, pithy manuals spreading better ideas on this subject among the people, would be of great value.

So, too, in regard to public office : it is well, indeed, in the recurring political revolutions to fight wire-pullers and bosses, and to tear them from their thrones. Here, too, that survival of the earlier instincts, that passion for fishing and hunting, may find a healthful satisfaction.

But the more quiet evolutionary process which I here advocate should also be borne in mind. More and more should the effort be to evolve out of the present loose indifference to sound political ethics the simple idea that public office is not a reward for mere partisan henchmen, not a personal favor to be dealt out by one individual to another, not a coinage in which tricksters pay

their debts at the expense of the public, but, to use a truism which from the mouth of a great public man has become a vitalizing truth, that "public office is a public trust." Let this idea be developed through the publications of this Association, through the pulpit, through the press, by the public meeting. More and more let there be evolved in the popular mind the simple idea that the highest fidelity is not the fidelity of party workers to party leaders, or of the leaders to the workers, or of both to the party, but that the highest fidelity is fidelity to the community, to the Commonwealth, to truth, and to justice. There should be evolved the spirit of fellow-soldiership with true men, the spirit which honors a man because he respects the truth, the spirit which allows great liberty to a statesman on minor questions, provided he be clearly true on the greater questions, the spirit which, while it does not expect candidates to be saints, will not permit them to be scoundrels.

Take next — a question which to each of us is a local question — the administration of our cities. Here we touch the weakest spot of our system, and one of which an Association like this, and all the educational agencies it can employ, should be constantly mindful. Our cities are the rotten spots in our body politic, from which, if we are not careful, decay is to spread throughout our whole country; for cities make and spread fashions, opinions, ideals. Simply as a matter of fact, our cities are the worst governed in the civilized world. In them there is a maximum of expenditure with a minimum of good result. The cause is not far to seek. We are making the same mistake which ruined the mediæval city republics,—governing them by partisan mobs, with no proper check or balance.

Our only safeguard at present is in periodical revolutions,—revolutions tearing down officials as soon as their plundering becomes unbearable. Far better would it be to evolve among the people truer ideas of municipal government. These ideas seem to me mainly two: first, the idea that cities are not political bodies; that the question in electing a mayor or alderman is not what he thinks on national questions, but what he can do as to city questions. Simple as this idea is, it is very scantily developed as yet. Such an agency as that which I now advocate might be very influential in spreading it. The other idea is that, as the city is a corporation, as it has to do not at all with political interests, but with corporate interests,—paving, sewerage, lighting, water supply, the repres-

sion of crime, care of the public health, public comfort, **public instruction**,—those should have some control who **have to pay** for all these things. Why may we not evolve out of our present city system, in addition to the Board of Aldermen elected by all the citizens, a Board of Control elected by tax-payers, without whose consent no franchise should be granted and no tax levied? At any rate, this Association may well invite the best minds of the country to take part in the discussion of this topic; and we may well consider, also, how the knowledge and ideas thus brought out may be made available in the country through our system of public instruction in its various grades.

So much, then, for the past history of this Association, with its general lessons for the future. Allow me now to narrow down our view by presenting two practical suggestions.

First, I would advocate the establishment, in the higher institutions of learning throughout the country, of courses of instruction in all the five main divisions of Social Science recognized by this Association. Especially should there be instruction as to the best dealings by towns, counties, States, and the nation, with pauperism, crime, inebriety, and other vices, lunacy in its various degrees, the organization and maintenance of Health Boards and hospitals, general sanitary measures, and the like. Already there has been collected in this country, as in other countries, a large body of literature which would serve as nutriment for such courses. Already the field has been surveyed and blocked out with the utmost care by the reports above referred to. In looking back over the quarter of a century during which this Association has been at work, no thinking man can fail to be struck with the great number of subjects on which it has thrown light by special investigations, broad generalizations, or acute thought. Many of these have a very direct bearing on the most important problems of to-day,—problems, indeed, which are likely to press upon us for many years longer. To a large extent these admirable papers now lie slumbering in our archives, but such departments as these I now advocate would make them a living agency for good. The professors in these departments would bring them out, study them, modify them, supplement them, and bring them to bear on the best minds of the country. To say nothing of the wide, general results for good, such agencies would greatly increase the future efficiency of this Association; they would attract a large number of active-minded young men into its membership, provide re-

searches for it, and take part in its discussions. Such young men would bring to it valuable practical knowledge ; they would come to it from boards of Village Trustees, from boards of County Supervisors, from the governing bodies of various charities, and from many executive and legislative positions. My hope, then, is that this Association will make some special effort to promote the establishment of such departments in our leading institutions of learning.

Here I would say a word regarding the admirable tractate of the Rev. John Graham Brooks, regarding special schools for the study of the science of charity. The good results accomplished abroad, as he shows us, and the good which might be accomplished at home, are undeniable. The value — nay, the necessity of such instruction he enforces with great power. But I would suggest to him and to others that such schools can only be made most effective when they are organized in connection with great institutions which bring together the active-minded young men of the country,— the men who are to become the future leaders in public affairs, the future managers of public institutions, and the future benefactors of humanity.

Again, the attention of men of wealth should be called more and more to the importance of endowing such departments of instruction in our Universities, and especially Professorships or Lectureships, with provision for the publication of results. My experience and observation in various institutions at home and abroad lead me to make two practical suggestions regarding such endowments.

First. The endowment for a Professorship or Lectureship should be sufficient to provide a salary large enough to secure the best talent and experience, enough to warrant some first-rate man in this field in devoting the necessary time to investigation as well as instruction.

Secondly. I think that the appointment in each case should be for a definite term, say three or five years, leaving it to the trustees of the institution to which the endowment is given to re-elect the Professor or not, as they shall see fit at the end of his term. I need hardly say that I am not led to this conviction by the experience of Cornell University thus far. I cannot conceive of the first incumbent of the Professorship there as ever outliving his usefulness in this field, but I make the recommendation on general principles.

Thirdly. I suggest to those who have not the means for the endowment of a Professorship, which might require a gift or bequest of sixty thousand dollars, or a Lectureship, which might require a gift or bequest of thirty thousand dollars, that much smaller sums might be made of great use. Ten thousand dollars would endow at any University in the country a Post-graduate Fellowship in this department, into which a young man who had shown himself especially fitted for such studies might be elected by the Faculty. Such a Fellowship would be of great use in enabling active-minded young men to perfect themselves in sundry departments of Social Science before going out into the world, either for investigation or for instruction. Here, too, I would make a supplementary suggestion. I would restrict the term of such a Fellowship to two years. This would prevent any such lounging or lingering of young men in a Fellowship as has injured the results of some such foundations at Oxford and Cambridge, in England. Moreover, I would require any young man holding such a Fellowship to give, say, one hour a day to university duty in his department, as an Instructor or an Examiner. He would thus be doubly useful to the department, and his experience as a teacher would not be without value to himself.

A still smaller sum (say, one to five thousand dollars) would be of use in providing a premium or premiums for the students giving the best reports, discussions, or essays on such subjects, in the field of Social Science, as the Faculty might assign.

So much in regard to the *higher* education in theoretical and practical Social Science. I now turn briefly, in conclusion, to the more wide-spread education, the diffusion of the principles of Social Science among the people at large.

In the year 1869, at one of the earlier meetings of the Association, Horace Greeley, then in his greatest activity, called our attention to the importance of some such work. He urged the preparation and publication of short, popular manuals for wide distribution among the people,—to use his own words, “embodying all that is known beyond dispute in the domain of Natural, Intellectual, and Moral Science.”

There is a certain crude common sense in this proposal which all that knew that great man will recognize as characteristic of him; but it shows more clearly still his controlling characteristic, that which made him great,—his desire to serve humanity, to lift up the masses of men, to make the world better for his having lived in it.

Out of Mr. Greeley's proposal, crude as it is, a suggestion may be obtained of the greatest value. What his proposal meant was the diffusion, through the masses of the people, of the results obtained by experts and specialists, with the ultimate result of the saturation of thinking men in the country with the more important of these ideas which have a practical bearing upon the welfare of our people. As examples of the subjects which he would have treated in such little tractates,— which he proposed should be of thirty-two to sixty-four pages each, and cost from five to ten cents, — he named, first, Ventilation ; second, Sexual Morality ; third, Habitation ; fourth, Health ; fifth, Food. And he added, "These five illustrations will do as well as fifty."

It will be seen at once that the first suggestion I make in this paper gives the means of providing for the plan advocated by this second suggestion. Provision in the higher institutions of learning for investigation and instruction in Social Science would bring out studies and applications of theory to practice which would naturally take this popular shape. Certain it is that the active-minded young men graduated from such schools would be admirably fitted, especially after some little practical experience, to prepare such manuals as Mr. Greeley suggested.

This fact suggests an answer to the question, Why has a plan so simple and good as this lain in abeyance for nearly a quarter of a century? That answer is clearly this: The *whole* of the scheme — the two halves of it, as I propose it,— that is, instruction of well-trained, selected young men, and instruction of the people at large — must go together. A mistake on this point is much like the mistake so constantly made in our schemes of public education,— the mistake of supposing that we may neglect root or trunk and still have flowers and fruit ; that without thorough provision for a supply of properly prepared teachers by high schools and Universities we can have excellent public schools.

This is the only reason, so far as I can see, why Mr. Greeley's suggestion, containing such excellent germs, has not borne the fruit which he expected. There has not been until recently any adequate agency for the training up of men to write such treatises, to popularize the results obtained by experts and special investigators, through the daily and weekly press and through such tractates as those which Mr. Greeley suggested. True, experts and investigators have done much ; but there needs to be some medium between them and the public, and that medium can only be given

us by training-schools, where masses of thinking and influential young men are brought together.

Out of a multitude of subjects on which such popular tractates might well be written, and which would suggest topics to the daily and weekly newspapers as well as to the pulpit, let me allude to just one; and I shall introduce it by showing the result of the want of simple instruction in it among the people. There has recently been passed a law removing the insane from County Poorhouses to State Hospitals. The law itself is a triumph of religion, morals, and right reason. It is indeed a blessed triumph over barbarism and greed, but it has been long in coming. It has been urged every year for nearly half a century in our State Legislature. Nearly forty years ago a most conclusive report was submitted by a Committee of our State Senate in favor of such a measure, yet it has taken all these years to accomplish it. Senator Bradford advocated it every year of his term, but in vain. Dr. Beck advocated it, but died without the sight of it. Dr. Willard, whose noble name the greatest of our present State Hospitals now bears, died while advocating the measure before a Committee of the Legislature, and his death aided in gaining what all the efforts of his life failed to accomplish.

Why this long delay? Simply because public opinion was not informed. No efficient body of men was trained to know the truth regarding the matter, and to support in the pulpit and in the press the efforts of such men as Bradford, Beck, and Willard. The people at large were completely in the dark as to the necessity of the change, and all they knew was that it would probably cost some money.

Take one more question. Noble efforts have been made and noble things done for the right dealing with crime. The efforts of such men as Wines, Dwight, Brockway, and Eugene Smith have not been in vain. Yet at this moment fearful abuses exist, especially in our County Jails, which good men are struggling in vain to overcome. Well did Professor Baldwin, in his paper before this Association, say that these jails are "boarding-schools for the young criminals, and shelters for the aged ones." In some of the most important penal institutions in leading counties of this State, young men imprisoned for the first time are brought into direct contact day after day, month after month, with old professional criminals. Only one result can follow such a system as this,—the multiplication of the criminals and ruffians who prey

upon the lives and property of the community, and the training of them to greater skill in their warfare against mankind.

A few years ago the Bishop of Central New York, and a number of the best citizens of one of our leading towns, appeared before a Board of Supervisors, urging and begging that this and similar abuses might be avoided by the slight expenditure necessary to separate different classes of criminals from each other. But no such measure could be passed. Why? Simply because these supervisors felt that there was no public opinion back of them which would warrant such an expenditure. The agencies I have advocated are exactly those which would produce a public opinion such as will warrant counties and legislators in making such needed reforms.

I might go on in each of these fields, and point out innumerable fruitful subjects deserving to be developed by experts, then brought to the highest class of students in our Universities, and finally popularized for the use of the country at large. But time is insufficient. Allow me, however, to make one more practical suggestion, directly bearing, as I conceive, upon an important duty of this Association.

In looking over its publications for the last twenty-five years, I have been struck by the multitude of fruitful subjects discussed, the value of the papers presented, and the acuteness of many suggestions which these papers have elicited. But they are so hidden away in our publications that few, even of those most interested, can find them. No general index has been made. Could there be any better means of celebrating this twenty-fifth anniversary than making provision for a thorough index of all these papers and discussions, so that any person interested in any subject of Social Science can know where to go with hope of securing the information he needs?

In conclusion, allow me to congratulate the Association on the arrival of this anniversary, on the work which has been accomplished, and on its prospects for the future. And, among subjects for congratulation, I also name the establishment at Philadelphia of the Academy for the Promotion of Social Science. It comes, properly indeed, in this twenty-fifth year of our corporate existence. So far from being injurious to the work of this Association, it ought to be, and can easily be made, most helpful to it. The function of the new organization will doubtless be to promote the most exact scientific study of all subjects in the great field. Ours will

doubtless be, while presenting such studies and investigations, to bring them to bear more fully upon a larger public. Both organizations should go hand in hand, each supplementing the work of the other.

With renewed congratulations on what has been accomplished, I declare the present meeting of the Association opened; and at the same time, proud as it may well be of its past, I bid it look with hope and trust to yet greater and broader work in the future.

[*The following is the Syllabus spoken of by President White on page 4.*]

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

SYLLABUS OF FOUR LECTURES ON THE DUTIES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION TOWARDS THE INMATES OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS AND IN REGARD TO THE DEPENDENT AND DELINQUENT CLASSES IN GENERAL.

BY F. B. SANBORN, INSPECTOR OF STATE CHARITIES
FOR MASSACHUSETTS.

FIRST LECTURE, WEDNESDAY, JAN. 27, 1887, AT 8 P.M.

I. Who, and how many, the Dependent and Delinquent Classes are.

1. The physically defective, including the blind, the deaf-mute, the idiotic, the congenitally disfigured, the crippled, etc.
2. The mentally or morally abnormal, including the insane, the inebriate, the unbalanced or "cranky" class, etc.
3. The unfortunate, and therefore dependent, including widows and orphan children, the old and infirm, strangers in the country, persons thrown out of work or suddenly deprived of means by fire, flood, or other calamity.
4. The sick, with those dependent on them.
5. The vicious, including persons habitually intemperate, prostitutes, vagrants, petty thieves, young offenders, etc.,—with the families of such, or persons who depend on them more or less.
6. The criminal class, including those who suddenly or habitually commit crime, and are either in prison or are living in the community, and may at any time be arrested for crime,—with those dependent on them and often involved in their crimes.

7. The actual inmates of such public establishments as prisons, almshouses, hospitals for the sick, the insane, etc., schools for the blind, deaf, and idiotic, asylums for special classes, such as old men and women, soldiers, sailors, orphans, etc.

8. Estimated number of these classes.

II. General and Special Duties toward the Classes named.

1. Duty of the State as representing the whole community.
2. Duty of the public in its individual capacity.
3. Duty of the professions, and especially the medical.

III. The Health of the Community and of Individuals as an Agent in producing the Dependent Classes.

1. Sanitary conditions and ordinary sickness.
2. Contagious diseases and epidemics.
3. Insanity and its causes.
4. Maternity and diseases of vice.

IV. Anomalous Position of the Medical Profession in regard to Disease and Vice.

SECOND LECTURE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3.

V. The True Character of a Public Establishment for a Dependent Class.

1. Its relation to the State and the public treasury.
2. The admission and detention of its inmates.
3. Their sanitary condition and treatment.
4. Their visitation and inspection by individuals or committees.
5. Professional and general criticism upon the management of an establishment.
6. Its direct educational value to the medical profession.

VI. Hospitals for the Sick and the Insane.

1. These two classes unreasonably separated in medical education.
2. Insanity a specialty, but also involving the most general considerations.
3. Insanity in general practice.
4. Clinical instruction as necessary in regard to insanity as to surgery or ordinary disease.

5. The Westborough Hospital as related to the Massachusetts Homœopathic Hospital and Boston University School of Medicine.

VII. Almshouses of the State or the Municipalities.

1. Indoor and outdoor relief.
 2. An almshouse necessarily a hospital in some degree.
 3. Outdoor medical relief and dispensary practice.
 4. The Massachusetts system of outdoor relief.
 5. The regulation and visitation of almshouses.
 6. The almshouse at Tewksbury and its history.
 7. The city almshouses of Boston.
-

THIRD LECTURE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10.

VIII. Maternity Hospitals and the Care of Young Children.

1. The need of maternity hospitals in cities, and the evils to be guarded against.
2. Infanticide and the desertion of children.
3. The Massachusetts system of care for motherless infants.
4. What may be done by physicians in this matter.
5. The disposal of "children of the State."

IX. Truant Children and Juvenile Offenders.

1. Vagrancy among children and grown persons.
 2. Truant schools and local or private reformatories.
 3. State reformatories.
 4. The family system for reforming young offenders.
-

FOURTH LECTURE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17.

X. Prisons and their Inmates.

1. The convicts themselves.
2. Their families and dependents.
3. Discharged prisoners.

XI. General remarks on the whole subject.

OPENING REMARKS AT THE GENERAL MEETING OF 1891.

BY ANDREW D. WHITE, PRESIDENT.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—Twenty-six years ago a handful of men assembled in a little room in one of our Eastern cities, and decided to form an association which should, as far as possible, keep abreast of the best methods adopted or discussed in this and other countries for the improvement of society. At the same time they took measures that their studies should not be those of pedants or *doctrinaires*. They determined that the questions they examined should be living questions; and, what was more, they determined that, while studying them, they would also study the best methods of bringing the results obtained to bear upon society. The steady elevation of labor in its remuneration and opportunities, the improvement of education in all its degrees, the diminution of preventable disease, the best dealing practicable with lunacy, pauperism, inebriety, vice, and crime, the evolution of better laws, the reformation of prison discipline,—these and kindred questions were the basis of their researches and of their activity.

The Association thus formed grew rapidly, and soon embraced elements which, although not discordant, were certainly varied. How varied they were may be judged from the fact that among those who took part in the early discussions were Horace Greeley, Henry Villard, and Samuel J. Tilden. As its scope extended, it crystallized into five distinct departments for the discussion of as many classes of questions: first, Education; second, Health; third, Trade and Finance; fourth, Social Economy; fifth, Jurisprudence. Each of these, of course, has in it germs which require to be developed by specialists, apart from the more general work of a Social Science Association, and this will be more especially seen with the third department, that of Trade and Finance, and the fifth, that of Jurisprudence, in which schools of Political Economy and of Law are an absolute necessity; still, that connection with special departments by no means takes them out of the wider field of Social Science.

Just a year ago we assembled in this city to celebrate the twenty-

fifth anniversary of the founding of the Association. It was indeed a happy occasion, the best meeting we had ever had; and as we looked back over the years intervening since that day when at Albany, in 1869, a few devoted members met for the first time in this State, there was occasion for reverent thankfulness at the spirit shown, the work done, the hopes warranted, the progress secured. At that meeting I discussed in my opening Address, at considerable length, the work of our Association from its beginning, taking up each of its five great divisions. I shall deliver no such elaborate address now. I shall only informally, as briefly as possible, call your attention to such matters during the past year as suggest new efforts or teach new lessons.

First, as to Education. In my Address last year I dwelt at length on the necessity of developing higher and more thorough instruction in social science at our larger universities and colleges. Surely, circumstances warranted me then in urging that subject, and warrant me now in recalling it. The more I think of it, the more important it seems to me that selected men at our institutions of learning, preparing for the various professions, for the pulpit, for the bar, for the press, and, above all, those who have some hope of entering public life, shall be trained as to the best methods and results obtained in the study of vice, crime, inebriety, lunacy,—all those subjects with which men in various public bodies, in boards of supervisors, in legislatures, in Congress, have much to do. I reiterate now the declaration I made then, that of all the endowments which I can think of for the benefit of our fellow-men, those which shall encourage such studies as these promise most for the diminution of human suffering and for the righting of human wrongs.

Most happy, then, am I to report progress during the year. At the University of Pennsylvania measures have been taken looking to a large extension of such studies. At Columbia College, in our great metropolis, a similar development is seen. The first session of the School of Applied Ethics this summer at Plymouth was another significant indication; and I am especially happy to announce that in the new department of Philosophy recently created at Cornell University by the Hon. Henry W. Sage, with an endowment of over two hundred and sixty thousand dollars (\$260,000), provision is made for the study of ethics with reference to these great questions of social concern.

Another point to which I then called attention was the *popular-*

ization of such instruction. I reminded you that this was a favorite idea of our former associate, Horace Greeley, sketching out to you the plan which he once presented to us. His proposal, to state it briefly, was that the Association should make condensed studies on matters of social value, and spread these studies in the form of leaflets or tracts among the people. Little has been accomplished in this direction ; but I would suggest as three most pertinent subjects, especially at this time, the Improvement of Roads and Internal Communications, Ballot Reform, and Hygiene.

Still another department then touched upon was Jurisprudence. I advocated the establishment of professorships or lectureships at our universities and colleges, and especially at our law schools, in Comparative Legislation. This was no new idea. Edward Laboulaye held, for many years at the College of France, a professorship with this title. Eminent as a lawyer, as a man of letters, above all as a broad philanthropist, he swept the whole horizon of jurisprudence, and gave to France treasures of knowledge thus gained for the improvement of her whole legal system. I mention his name with especial love and gratitude ; for he it was who, in spite of the frowns of imperial power at Paris, stood firmly by the United States during the rebellion, making his lecture-room a centre of influence in behalf of American liberty and union. Here, too, a notable event has occurred during the past year. In the paper of our colleague, Professor Baldwin of Yale, at a recent session of the American Bar Association in Boston, he presented a comparison of the more important enactments of our various legislatures during the past year, which must have been most suggestive to his hearers. But the most important thing in it, so far as my present purpose is concerned, is its corroboration of my contention of last year. I then insisted that no country in the world presents so good a field for studies in comparative legislation as this. Not only are the legislative bodies of the whole civilized world open to us, but about forty State legislatures are continually presenting various solutions of important questions in legislation. Among these I might mention the dealings of some thirty of our States with the question of ballot reform, and the dealings of many other commonwealths with that question which is daily growing in importance among us,—the question of the best dealings with professional criminals.

Again, in the matter of dealing with crime. The past year has at least produced one book which, though it cannot be entered

into the category of great works on the subject, is certainly of value. This work of Dr. Morrison is based upon extensive experience and earnest thought. To me, its main significance lies in the fact that it seems to furnish a refutation of some of those arguments of Lombroso which have been adduced at previous sessions of this Association, to prove that crime is merely a disease,—a contention which, it seems to me, is fraught with no small danger to the body politic.

And, finally, in the field of Hygiene there has been one notable event. The recent meeting of men eminent in this field, in Washington, marks an epoch. The papers presented were of great interest and value, and perhaps most notable were the statements showing the inutility of quarantine. It was certainly a great step toward relieving the trade and travel of the world from a system which has been fraught with great loss, and has caused much unmerited suffering. Happy should we be at receiving any information, from perhaps the most eminent body in this field which has ever come together, that modern hygienic research and practice have at last enabled the world to dispense, in great measure, with quarantine regulations.

I may also, in reviewing the past year, congratulate our Association upon progress made by other organizations in the same field. From various parts of Europe there come to us reports showing excellent work in every department of it. The new Academy of Social Science, at Philadelphia has presented this year a remarkable series of papers. The School of Applied Ethics at Plymouth, to which I have already referred, produced a series of most fruitful discussions.

Such supplementary work as this is not at all to supersede ours: it is to strengthen it. I remember that during the anti-slavery struggle that very eminent and noble man, Gerrit Smith, once spoke to me with admiration of the splendid work then accomplished by Henry Ward Beecher. Said Mr. Smith, "I have been trying all my life to clutch the truth with both hands; but Beecher gets one arm around truth and the other round humanity, and then forcibly but lovingly brings them together." Is there not in this a statement of our own function? Other societies may have it for their purpose to make minute researches, more especially for scholars; others still may have it as their entire object to popularize the principal results of social science. Ours, it seems to me, should be, while promoting the strictest research, to lay hold at

the same time of the public at large, and bring the results of our research to bear upon society around us.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, we are fairly entered into our second quarter of a century. Its termination will bring the Association well into the twentieth century of our era. Thus far it certainly has been productive of great good. Very many of the researches and results formulated have taken material shapes of various sorts for the improvement of society. So may it continue to be. May the work of this Association continue to leaven our material prosperity, and infuse into it nobler sentiments and higher aspirations! May it go on diminishing inebriety, crime, pauperism, oppression and wrong of every sort! May it give to the laboring man a lot more and more enviable, and to all mankind purer lives and higher ideals; and to this end may it have the blessing of God and the co-operation of all men willing to think and work for humanity.

I. PAPERS OF THE SOCIAL ECONOMY DEPARTMENT.

I. PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS ON LABOR ORGANIZATION.

BY SAMUEL M. HOTCHKISS, OF HARTFORD, CONN.

The interests of capital and labor are not identical, but they need not and should not conflict. Each is essential to the other, and justly entitled to its fair share of the benefits which they jointly produce. No plain law has yet been discovered for the settlement of this account, by which the scales of justice have been made to balance. Nearly two thousand years ago a carpenter's son proposed a plan which did not meet with much favor at the time, but has since commanded some attention as applicable to the settlement of such questions. Unfortunately, its principles have not been conspicuous in the treatment of this question by either party.

The laborer has found that he cannot stand alone in the modern industrial struggle. Mechanical invention and immigration have encroached upon his opportunities for remunerative employment, till he has met the emergency in the only way open to him. Labor organization is the natural and necessary outgrowth of conditions for the existence of which he is not responsible.

It aims to unite the mass of workers to maintain and advance their common interests. If this aim could be fully realized, the irresponsible use of the vast power of such organization might prove a serious danger to society. This danger, however, is not likely to be realized. The masses may be stirred to united action to attain a specified end, like the movement for shorter hours of labor, but experience has proved that they cannot be held permanently together. Only a small proportion is efficiently organized. The permanent value of their organization will depend upon a just use of its power and the degree in which it is made mutually beneficial to employer and employed.

The laboring men knew what they wanted, but did not know the best way to attain it. Their want of discrimination in the use of unaccustomed power was one leading cause which brought labor organization into public disrepute. Capital, which did not understand the reason for the movement, regarded it as a dangerous impertinence, and was quick to take advantage of its mistakes to array the forces of society against it. Employers made the great mistake of fighting organization instead of assisting their workmen to distinguish and utilize the good, and avoid the evil involved in it. But recently there has been a most salutary change in the treatment of this question by both sides.

The attitude of employers toward labor organization down to a recent period, and the radical change which is taking place, is aptly illustrated by the relations between the hat manufacturers and the trades-unions in Danbury, Conn., which are among the oldest in the State and country. The unions were organized in 1850, when the manufacturers began a struggle to maintain their independence of the unions, which lasted for thirty-five years. During this whole period strikes and shop calls were of daily occurrence, and often paralyzed business. The labor cost of an order could not be safely predicted, nor the time when it could be completed. Frequent periods of idleness subjected the working people and tradesmen to serious inconvenience and loss. Finally, the hat manufacturers, tired of the wasteful struggle, proposed to the unions that both parties cease hostilities and seek peaceful means for the settlement of difficulties without the interruption of business.

Upon a suggestion from the trades-unions, the manufacturers organized the Manufacturers' Association, which entered into permanent agreements with each union, by which provision was made for the adjustment of all questions, including wages, through committees, and, in case of disagreement, by arbitration. Non-union workmen were admitted to the unions, and all the factories submitted to union rules.

This common-sense action in Danbury, in 1885, practically closed the vexatious warfare which had prevailed for a whole generation. For six years business has met with no interruption, except the lockout in November, 1890, caused by the attempt of the Trimmers' Union to withdraw from the compact, which did not succeed, and the principle was established that neither party can withdraw from the compact without the consent of the other.

The vitality of the trade idea is illustrated by an incident which occurred during this contest. The Trimmers' Union is composed of women and girls to the number of seventeen or eighteen hundred. The Manufacturers' Association, fearing that the course of the trimmers would endanger the trade agreements, decided to destroy their union. But, with all the combined power and influence which the seventeen wealthy corporations in the association could bring to bear, their effort failed, and the ranks of the union remained unbroken. Fortunately, the association and all of the unions sustain the integrity of the trade agreement, and there is no prospect of further disturbance.

It is interesting to note that the dissatisfaction of the trimmers grew out of the introduction and use of machines and the principle of subdivision of labor in trimming hats; and, further, that, while members of the union were displaced, the innovations made it possible for a union shop to make cheap grades of hats at a profit, using high-priced union labor, in competition with non-union shops, using low-priced non-union labor. It not infrequently happens that loss in one direction, by reason of such changes, is partially or wholly compensated by gain in another.

The experience of the last six years in Danbury clearly demonstrates that it is possible for capital and labor, by perfecting instead of fighting organization, to maintain the just rights of both parties and harmonize clashing interests without resort to force.

Fortunately, the prevailing assumption that organized labor has no right to any voice in the adjustment of wages and other conditions, vitally affecting the laborer, that employers are bound to respect, is giving place to more just and reasonable views. The superior advantages which wealth, education, and commanding business and social relations confer on employers, should be used to supplement the honest efforts of the less favored working class, in seeking equitable adjustment of difficulties for the existence of which neither is responsible, but which both must face.

The dissatisfaction of the laboring man with his present limitations is one of the hopeful signs of progress. The first President Dwight, President of Yale College one hundred years ago, in referring to the indisposition of the Englishman of that day to attempt to grow out of the condition in which he was born, said, "If an Englishman is born to the wheel-barrow, he never will aspire to the hand-cart." In A.D. 1100 a charcoal-burner named Purkess found the dead body of William II., son of the Conqueror, who

had been shot with an arrow in the New Forest, and carried it jolting in his rough cart to Winchester cathedral. "Lineal descendants of this man are reported living in the same spot, who have constantly been proprietors of a horse and cart, but never attained to the possession of a team" (more than one beast). They occupy the same rank to-day as their ancestor who furnished rough transportation for the carcass of the second Norman king eight hundred years ago.

The fact that the working people of America are stirred with ambition for solid advancement in life is cause for profound satisfaction. Labor organizations have contributed largely to the public good in this country and Europe, in awakening and fostering the manly ambition of the working people.

A large proportion of the members of the unions is from the less intelligent classes of the working people. In many of the trades intelligent mechanics who receive liberal wages do not feel personal need of organization and prefer to act independently. Labor organization suffers for want of the help of these men, whose higher intelligence and wider experience would insure wiser and more conservative leadership. Most unions restrict membership to actual workmen. This is probably wise; but unions suffer serious loss by the promotion of their best men to positions of trust, which disqualifies them for membership. It is a curious fact that in these changed relations overseers and managers often become unfriendly to the system, and labor difficulties are sometimes aggravated by the jealousy of workmen of overseers and bosses promoted from the ranks.

The loyalty and unselfish fidelity of the members to the unions, and their willingness to share their earnings with fellow-unionists, can in almost all cases be implicitly relied upon, however great the inconvenience may be to themselves and their families.

The Knights of Labor are entitled to the credit of organizing and developing the principle of settling disputes by means of friendly conference and arbitration. It is a reasonable and common-sense method, and should receive universal encouragement. Owing to the complex character of the organization, the masses of the working people prefer the simpler form adopted by the trades-unions, which they can easily understand.

While the unions were not, like the Knights of Labor, special advocates for the peaceful settlement of difficulties by arbitration and conciliation, the principle has now been practically adopted by all organizations.

The enrolled membership of the unions is small compared with the mass of the working people, but it has the advantage of organization. A dozen men thoroughly organized have greater efficiency than hundreds or even thousands without it. While their mistakes have been numerous, trade organizations, as a whole, have exerted a powerful, progressive influence. All the State bureaus of labor statistics and that of the United States were established through their direct efforts. Imperfect as the organization is, it affords the best and almost the only practical means for direct communication with the laboring people. The work of the bureaus of labor statistics is greatly aided by this means of intercourse. Ballot reform, and especially the adoption of the official ballot, was strenuously advocated by all labor organizations long before its importance received public recognition; and it is through their direct efforts that the system has been so extensively adopted. Their agitation for this cause and for weekly payments, factory inspection, shorter hours of labor, and other reforms, has met with marked success.

But their greatest efforts have been expended upon questions affecting wages. In this field, which appeals directly to their most pressing needs as well as to their selfish instincts, their intelligent leaders have found the greatest difficulty in convincing the rank and file that wages cannot be permanently increased on a falling market, and that the organization which is designed to help the laboring man to obtain justice can only be legitimately used, under proper conditions, to secure a just advance or to prevent or retard an improper decrease, and that permanent success can only come to the union or to him personally from a course that will promote the mutual good of employer and employed.

Extended observation justifies the belief that these views are now generally held by union men. Many employers frankly say that under such conditions the unions can be as beneficial to them as to the workmen. Numerous instances have recently been reported in Connecticut in which employers have advised their employees to organize, believing that it would result to their mutual advantage.

An extensive builder and contractor recently said, referring to the unions of carpenters, masons, bricklayers, hod-carriers, and others connected with the building trades, that he had no objection to these organizations. He said that he saw no reason why the laboring people had not as good a right to organize and to say who should be admitted to their several trades, and to do what

they could to obtain liberal remuneration, as ministers, lawyers, and doctors had to organize their societies and unions, and to say who should be permitted to practise or officiate in their several professions; under what conditions their members should be permitted to earn their daily bread, and to fix their fees for professional services; or as business men had to combine to promote their interests. He said that the unions had never complained of his discharge of men for cause. He further said the average workmen furnished by the unions were superior to the average under the old system. Answers to inquiries of prominent builders in other cities and towns in Connecticut were in substantial accord with those referred to. Jevons says,* "All classes of society are trade unionists at heart, but differ chiefly in the boldness, ability, and secrecy with which they push their respective interests."

In connection with the foregoing opinions of builders and contractors, it is proper to note that there are others, especially among the smaller contractors, who are restive under the new order of things and who do not accept the situation willingly. But, so far as these inquiries have extended, the opinion seemed to prevail that, on the whole, in the building trades the unions are helpful to both employer and employed.

Contractors say that they find little embarrassment on account of any advance in the labor cost falling on the property owner by reason of fewer hours of daily labor in the building trades. The opposition to the unions, based on the theory that capitalists will not build if remunerative wages are paid, seems to be hardly justified by the facts. Capitalists who have been interviewed say substantially that they are not only willing, but prefer, that labor should be liberally paid. Inquiry and observation in other manual trades and employments show similar results, but varying according to the conditions affecting each particular trade.

The question whether the union will be advantageous or otherwise to the contractor, and especially to the employees, depends upon the intelligence, good judgment, and business qualifications of the contractors and union officials. Either party wanting these favorable conditions may make the relations of capitalists, contractors, and employees intolerable. Experience seems to justify the conclusion that the union admits of reciprocal relations which may make it advantageous to both parties and to society.

The effectiveness of trade organization in mechanical industries comes far short of that attained in the manual trades. In all man-

*Preface to "State in Relation to Labor."

ufactories labor is struggling to find its proper adjustment in the sweeping changes from manual to mechanical production. The average intelligence required in the masses of working people employed in all factories becomes lower and lower as inventive genius multiplies the means for mechanical production. Major Bent, president of the Pennsylvania Steel Company, said in a recent address, referring to their large works at Steelton, near Harrisburg, Penn.: "When that plant was started, the average wages of our men was above four dollars per day. Now the average is about one dollar and seventy-five cents per day." Numerous cases showing equally radical changes might be cited.

It is here that intelligent labor encounters its hardest conditions. All the operatives in a given occupation may suddenly find their occupation abolished. Continued production of a given article often depends upon keeping the labor cost from advancing or forcing a reduction. The employer is as much perplexed as the employee. The demand of the union for increased wages is met with the assurance that the increase demanded would result in closing production, or in substituting mechanical means for accomplishing the work now performed by human hands. Many of the large manufacturers keep in their employ experts and inventors for the purpose of reducing the labor cost of production by improving their labor-saving machines. A single illustration is in point.

The manager of one of the largest manufactories of hardware in Connecticut recently said that two years ago they were manufacturing an article at a cost of six dollars and fifty cents per dozen, which involved the labor of fifty-seven men. They were able to sell the article at a profit of fifty cents per dozen. A competing establishment was manufacturing the same article, but at a cost which gave the first the advantage in the market. A committee of the union called upon the manager and urged an increase of wages. He showed them the facts as stated, and that the proposed advance would give the trade to the competing firm. He further informed them that, if the labor cost was increased, it would compel them to do most of the work by machinery. The demand was pressed, and the advance granted. The result was that in a few months machinery was built by the aid of which seven men produced more goods than had been produced by the fifty-seven formerly employed, at a cost of only three dollars and fifty cents per dozen. Of course, the result displaced fifty of the men employed in the manufacture of that one article. Numerous similar

incidents might be cited in other lines of manufacture. The radical changes in methods of production in all mechanical industries render any permanent solution of the intricate problem in these lines extremely difficult, if not impossible.

It is true, however, that there are mechanical industries, limited in their extent, in which labor organization meets reasonable success in influencing the conditions of labor.

In one of these, having but seven manufactories in the whole country, only skilled operatives trained to that work can be profitably employed. The limited number of operatives are closely organized in unions which have succeeded in securing remunerative wages. The occupations are similar to those in another line of industry requiring a similar grade of skill, which employs thousands of operatives who are not efficiently organized. The lowest wages paid in the organized industry are two dollars per day. Nearly all, however, earn from three to three and a half dollars per day, and in some cases four and four and a half dollars; while operatives of the same grade in the other line receive wages varying from ninety cents to one dollar and a quarter, and in rare instances one dollar and a half per day. The proportion who receive as much as one dollar and a quarter per day is small.

But for the close organization of the skilled operatives in the limited industry, by means of which apprenticeship and admission to their unions are limited and controlled, equally skilled operatives in the similar line would immediately become competitors for their places, and wages would fall to the lower scale. In maintaining liberal compensation, this union does no wrong to the manufacturers, since all are subject to the same conditions, and the difference in the increased labor cost of goods to the consumer is infinitesimal.

It would be a public benefit if the thousands engaged in the similar occupations referred to could secure to themselves like remunerative wages instead of the present beggarly income of ninety cents to one dollar and a quarter per day, which necessitates the employment of wife and children in the mills in order to secure a daily income equal to that of the father alone in the other similar employment; while the public who consume the goods, notwithstanding the modern craze for the bargain counter, would willingly pay the increased labor cost in the purchasing price of the goods.

In some trades the efficiency of local unions is supplemented by the action of those in other places whose members use the prod-

ucts of the former's labor. This is illustrated by the case of the local unions of quarrymen, and the unions of stone masons, stone cutters, and carmen who use or handle the quarry products. The local unions of quarrymen were materially assisted in their strikes for shorter hours with increased pay by the refusal of unions to use or handle their products for building or other purposes in New York and other large markets till their demands were complied with, which seriously embarrassed, and in some instances stopped, the business of the quarry companies.

Many of the most intelligent workmen believe that the agitation of the movement for shorter hours of labor will prove to be the most effective agent for the equitable adjustment of the general labor problem. It is the leading question in all of the labor organizations to-day.

The absurd theory that a man can perform as much work in eight hours as he can in ten is not held by the working people. They believe that, if the hours of labor are reduced 20 per cent., it will require a corresponding increase of laborers to perform a given amount of labor in a given time. They further believe that, if the percentage of decrease in the hours of labor is greater than the percentage of the unemployed, there will necessarily be appreciation in wages.

The agitation for shorter hours has awakened general public sympathy for the movement. Intelligent employers say that the objections are not to the change itself, but to the practical difficulties which must be encountered in bringing it about in important lines of mechanical industries where it will meet its gravest difficulties. But the movement has met with practical success in the building and some other manual trades, and indications favor its general success.

Wages under an eight or nine hour day will be adjusted on precisely the same principles which control under a ten-hour day, and should be treated as an independent question. If combined with the movement for shorter hours, it will be sure to give the impression that the object of the latter is merely to increase wages.

The use of the strike, boycott, lockout, and black list, has fallen into disrepute, but is by no means obsolete. Of these objectionable expedients, the black list is the least excusable and the most unpopular. It is a system of terrorism borrowed from the dark ages, and is utterly unworthy of the otherwise honorable men who still permit its use. No employer is willing to admit that it has

ever been employed in his establishment, and yet in disguised and hidden forms it prevails wherever there is an attempt to enforce the requirements of organized labor. It prevails to the greatest extent in places where organization is most effective.

It is a serious fact that officers of unions and members of committees who are conspicuous in maintaining contested union interests are very likely to find themselves practically blacklisted. Discharge is never attributed to this cause, and frequently does not immediately follow the offence; but sooner or later some plausible excuse, like "dull times," is utilized to drop the objectionable hand, who will be refused work in other factories. Many cases might be cited in proof of these statements. Some skilled hands are received back after a limited period of enforced idleness.

Tradesmen and professional men often decline to serve as arbitrators, because they are afraid that connection with sharply contested arbitration might injure their business by incurring the displeasure of one side or the other.

In Danbury one leading hat firm declined to join the Manufacturers' Association, but complied with the union rules. Their factory forms an asylum for men and women who have been practically blacklisted in the other shops. They are among the best workmen and women in the trades. It is invaluable to the unions, because it enables them to draw the ablest unionists for officers and members of committees from this shop's crew, as it is termed, all of whom are beyond the reach of the dreaded blacklist.

The danger to employees in forming unions and taking positions as officers and members of committees is still real, and is encountered in almost all lines of industry.

In mercantile lines agreements are made between employers that they will not employ a man or woman discharged by another employer in their line, or who leaves such employer without his recommendation for honesty and efficiency. It would be difficult to find recorded evidence of such agreement; but numerous cases could be cited which prove the existence of this form of practical blacklisting. The fact remains that in mercantile as well as mechanical pursuits the practice prevails to an extent bordering on conspiracy.

The laboring people, as a rule, have small confidence in the efficacy of profit-sharing and similar plans for securing to them their share of the products of their labor. Nearly all prefer the plan of fixed wages, which are not subject to contingencies and

conditions with which they are wholly unfamiliar. The system works smoothly when there are profits to be distributed ; but, when the frequent intervals of depression occur, and there are no profits, the question of fair dealing in the manipulation of the accounts is almost sure to be raised. Even if the workmen were admitted to an inspection of the books, it would be of little practical service, because they are not familiar with methods of book-keeping and the principles of business management. In Connecticut at least they believe that the practical effect of all such schemes is to reduce wages sufficiently to discount all receipts from so-called profit-sharing. They have a shrewd suspicion that in some way the dividend to the employee is provided for to the profit of his generous employer.

An interesting experiment under the name of Gain-sharing attempts to obviate this objection to the profit-sharing plan. Here, too, the advantage to labor is challenged by the laborers, because the accounts are all kept by the employers, for which service they appropriate one-half of the gains, if any there be. They control the wages of their men, and many of the employees believe that in practical operation the depreciation in wages will in some way more than balance their half of the gains. It is evident that the success of any of these plans for profit-sharing presupposes a degree of intelligence in the average workingmen and of their confidence in employers which has not yet been attained.

The revolution in public thought and sympathy on the subject of labor organization during the last five years is remarkable. When the observations upon which these remarks are based began five years ago, reasonable and intelligent men among the organized laboring people, in referring to their efforts for labor reform, used the following truthful language : —

“We are not understood by the public, our actions are misrepresented, and our motives are misjudged ; we have never had opportunity to lay before the public a fair expression of our ideas on the labor question ; our papers published in the interest of labor reform are only read by a few of the laboring people ; the public press will not exchange with our papers or copy articles which fairly represent our views. In reporting our meetings, they only ridicule us for our failures and mistakes. The public is ignorant of the merits of our cause, and we are condemned without a hearing.”

To-day the secular and religious newspapers freely open their

columns to the broadest discussion of the interests of labor and labor organization, and fully and fairly report all of their meetings in their news columns. In magazines and innumerable other publications, in the pulpit and on the platform, the subject is treated and discussed by the ablest minds in professional and business life.

Study of its practical features has a large place in the departments of political and social science in all of our schools and colleges, under professors and teachers who are almost to a man radical in their ideas of industrial progress and reform. Social science and economic associations provide for open discussion of the subject, in which representatives of the workingmen and their societies are invited to give free expression to their views and participate in the discussions.

While the greatest efforts of labor organizations have been expended upon questions affecting wages, it is doubtful whether the advantages reaped by the laboring people from their contests with capital at all compare with the results of their efficient educational and benevolent work, and their efforts for the establishment of bureaus of labor statistics, ballot reform, weekly payments, factory inspection, shorter hours of labor, and other reforms of lasting value to society.

The contest between capital and labor is by no means ended, but the time must come when each will have learned that its interests can in no way be served by hostile relations. Improved conditions will not come through sudden revolution, but through the slower process of evolution. That passion and prejudice have blinded and warped the better judgment of both sides in such a sharply contested field is not strange. Selfish cupidity will continue to retard, but cannot stop, progress. The best interests of society are inextricably involved in the contest. Legal enactment may be helpful in attaining special ends, but public opinion is the court of final appeal. No organization of capital or labor can long maintain itself in opposition to an enlightened public sentiment. Once make the facts in the case clearly evident, and the final public verdict will demand justice.

It is the privilege and the duty of labor organizations to give to the public full and authentic statistics relating to this subject. In such educational work lies their highest and most effective usefulness.

2. TRADE-UNIONS: THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS, METHODS, AND AIMS.

BY SAMUEL GOMPERS, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF LABOR, NEW YORK.

After eighteen hundred years the most eminent of the world's scholars have not hesitated to write "Explanations and Defences" of the Christian religion. The Trade Unionist need not therefore wonder that he, too, while defending a cause which dates back still further in the past, should be called upon again and again to give reasons for the faith within him, and reply to the new sceptics every generation produces. Long before Peter trod the streets of Rome or Paul addressed the people of Athens, the workers, the artisans of both Rome and Greece, had been forced into combinations.

At that day religion and politics were one : there was no line of separation between Church and State. Slavery was the normal type of those who labored ; yet, as civilization spread and cities rose, luxuries grew in demand, and with demand arose a new class, that of free artisans, skilled in all the arts of their various callings. But whether in combinations of the captured and doomed to slavery, or in protective associations of freemen, dire necessity alike compelled unity of action. The rapacity of the rich, the unbridled licentiousness and cruelty of the age, made the life of the toiler a dark and dismal one. Yet in spite of all threats and punishments, or rather because of them, the oppressed grew closer together, and silently whispered their grievances and their hopes. The history of the ancient guilds, their federation for mutual support, their pious care of the sick, and provision for the burial of the dead are matters well known, and which I need not here enter into.

In speaking of their aims, what I chiefly desire to emphasize is the fact that wherever a union of the toilers has come into existence it has arisen from a necessity to combat oppression. A free people never rebel. Before a man can become rebellious to existing circumstances, he must have grievances ; and it is only when these eat into his soul, and goad him on to either desperation or retaliation, that concert of action is instinctively felt essential.

Their aim was ever the same,— protection and mutual assistance under adverse conditions. But, it may be asked, if their aims are the same to-day as over two thousand years ago, wherein has there been any progress, if the producers of the world's wealth are still contending against injustice and combining to redress grievances?

The conditions are vastly changed from those of preceding centuries. In Christian lands chattel slavery has ceased. The taint of labor no longer carries with it legal servitude. Yet in what manner can Trade Unionism claim aught towards this achievement? In the first place, it can be confidently asserted that whatever tends to produce solidarity directly aids progress; for it is by the union of people for a common purpose, the subordination of personal to general aims, that a higher standard of social morality is attained, the sympathetic nature of man quickened, and the human brought into greater prominence over the selfish animal nature. The history of England and France illustrates in a marked degree the influence of Unions upon human progress. While England presents the battle-field where the guilds have uninterruptedly continued their warfare for centuries, and have done much to establish the sturdy independence of the toilers, France no less illustrates the influence of the spirit of industrialism.

When the first wild cry for the Crusades rang throughout Europe, civilization itself seemed to be in its midnight hour. The downfall of the Roman Empire, the repeated invasions of the Goth, Hun, and Vandal, the growing strength of Moor and Moslem, the constant wars of proud baronial lords, the abject condition of the serfs, the superstitious dread in high and low of all that indicated change, seemed to prophesy the fate of the empires of the East for the future of Europe. But the crusaders built wiser than they knew. As the exigencies of the later day brought emancipation to the black race in the South, so did it then to the serf. For centuries the serf had toiled in the same weary rut worn by his ancestors. Attached to the soil, and sold with it like the oxen he drove before the plough, unable to learn the state to which he belonged, his knowledge of the world was limited to the visible horizon. But in taking up the cross of the Crusade he became a freeman. For two centuries the contest was waged to rescue the Holy Land; and, though the Moslem remained in its possession, the battle was not lost. For during those two centuries there was a constant return of emancipated pilgrims,—men who had

seen other lands, other civilizations, strange arts and luxuries of which they were hitherto ignorant. New desires, new wants, arose; and in every city of France skilled artisans were called upon to supply them. Within the walled city, the Commune of France, against the rapacity of the feudal baron with his armed retainers were pitted the industrial organizations, whose very existence demanded peaceable conditions. There more than anywhere else was most clearly seen that struggle which characterizes progressive civilization,—on the one side, militant measures, relying upon the past, and, on the other, industrial measures, looking forward to the future. The King possessed but little real authority; but, allying his own cause with that of the artisans in these walled Communes (a strange alliance of king and toiler), the proud baron was over and again defeated, and the feudal tyranny supplanted.

As in earlier history the two opposing systems were slavery and trades-unionism,—the one compulsory servitude, the other voluntary co-operation,—so here we find the guilds strengthening the hands of order in the interest of peace.

Louis IX., Saint Louis as he is termed, in return for the aid thus rendered to the crown, whereby France was enabled to escape from the tyranny and horrors of feudal rule, formally recognized the Unions, and granted them privileges unknown in any other country. In short, it may be confidently asserted that the growth of French nationality, the solidifying of divergent interests, culminating in the Golden Age (as it is termed) of Louis XIV., was due chiefly to the organized artisans of that country. The student of history will not pause to consider whether such an alleged "Golden Age" was a perfect one or not, but he will realize the point I wish to emphasize: that the impetus given by the co-operation of king and guild tended to progress, annihilated feudal disorder, and furthered peaceful evolution.

On the one side, the past was represented by the mailed knight, intent on private revenge or plunder, carrying with him terror and desolation into countless homes: his only productive skill consisted in creating widows and orphans. On the other side, the future loomed up in the form of youthful Industry, to whom liberty and peace were as essential as air to lung-breathing animals. And yet but for organization these efforts would have been fruitless, and chaos and disorder would have remained. It is true that authority finally gained the upper hand, and forgot the debt of obligation due to these humble allies; but in the seed sown a spirit

grew which culminated in the French Revolution, and has changed the face of the political and social world.

While this was accomplished by the French artisans through the causes and means mentioned, it must be conceded to the English that they made the most heroic and stubborn fight for industrial liberty. The laws in England for centuries continued so oppressive that even within scarcely more than a century the condition of Scottish miners was really that of serfdom. An author of repute states: "They were obliged to remain in the pit as long as the owner chose to keep them there; and they were actually sold, as part of the capital invested in the work. If they took work elsewhere, their master could always fetch them back, and flogged as thieves for having robbed him of their labor" (*Trant*). The power of the justices to fix wages continued even so late as 1812. In the fourteenth century all organizations of workmen were prohibited as "conspiracies." In fact, less than a hundred years ago, until 1795, no workman could legally travel, in search of employment, out of his own parish. But restrictive laws and enactments to fix wages always end in failure. The day had passed when toilers could patiently submit. As W. T. Thornton tersely says, "Men are seldom collected together in large masses without speedily discovering that union is strength; and men whose daily avocation obliged them to be constantly using, and by use to be constantly sharpening, their wits, were not likely to be backward in making this discovery." As a result of this determined opposition of the British workmen, Trade unions are now legal societies there, with due protection given to their funds, thus becoming constitutionally incorporated as institutions of that country.

To sum up their achievements in a sentence, we may briefly say, that, wherever the people enjoy most liberty, there Trade unions are most formidable. On the contrary, in those countries where long hours prevail, where poverty sits installed at the domestic hearthstone, where want and misery preside over the household economy, and hope is but a barren mockery and a dream, there the Trade union is not. And it is from these lands that our plutocratic adorers of abstract liberty seek to import "hands," numbering them with a tag, to supplant the labor of those whose brawn and muscle have won for them the liberty they delight to praise so vociferously on each recurring Fourth of July.

I have said that in those countries where economic and social

misery abound and are the rule Trade unions do not exist. Permit me to add that, as in physical life the germs require natural conditions to their full development, so in the economic struggle for better and more humane conditions of life, the first seeds of discontent must make themselves manifest. In other words, a spirit of greater independence and awakening intelligence is essentially prerequisite to the organization of the Trade-union.

But their methods are revolutionary, we are told. Yes, in a sense they are. To-day, as in the past, unity of action is the result of necessity. Conditions have changed, it is true; but the fight must still be waged, though it be on other grounds. The religious and political issues of the past no longer enter into the contest, but year by year the issue is more clearly seen to be purely an economic one. The workman no longer tolerates religious dissension in his craft guild: to do so would be to thresh past century straw. The devout and undevout meet together, without knowing each other's religious preferences. In the modern Union religion is a matter of conscience, which each must settle for himself, acting upon his own responsibility. But trade matters, questions of wages, hours, working rules (which, by the way, when enforced without or against the voice or consent of the toilers, are more tyrannical and bear worse upon him than all the laws of country or State), and other conditions of labor involve a common interest, and upon these accord is found. Political issues, purely as such, likewise find the Union barren ground for sowing. There has been a steady growing conviction among organized toilers that political aims cannot settle economic demands. In spite of present efforts to unite the toilers of the land, both in factory and farm, upon a platform of political demands, I think I am right in asserting that the Unions — as such — will not be found committing themselves to any such programme. Individual members in large numbers undoubtedly will, but it will be as citizens rather than trade unionists.

And I may be here pardoned for a digression in connection with opposing methods in organizing toilers. One hundred years ago nothing was more common than bitter animosity between trades: battles between the journeymen of one and those of another were of frequent occurrence in the streets of London and Paris. Self-preservation was instinctively felt to be protection of trade privilege. To-day how different is the situation! Increased personal liberty has widened human fellowship; and, in the Feder-

ations of Labor here and abroad, the interests of the whole are seen to be best subserved in the welfare of each. In our country the general support given to the carpenters in their struggle for shorter hours is an example,—an instance, which that splendid body of independent toilers will more than cheerfully reciprocate to whichever of their allied brethren will next assume the banner at the front. Nor need we rely on this movement that the carpenters have made or other trades may make, as an example of the solidarity of feeling and concert of action resulting from the separately organized Unions. Every day, in city, town, and village, the same spirit and action are manifested in instances of heroic and temporary self-sacrifice that are made to advance the interests of those working at one trade,—in the hope, yes, the knowledge, that by such assistance the best interests of the entire grand army of labor are promoted.

On the other hand, we are met with a siren song which, promising an "Ideal" (some might say Idealistic) organization, virtually disrupts trade lines and destroys autonomous action, by subordinating independence to obedience to central authority. As Trade Unionists, we know nothing of mixed unions: we ask, in the warfare for greater industrial independence, that each combatant march under his own banner, where united action is final and obligatory upon those who may be selected to lead. In short, we oppose all effort to introduce militant measures issuing from the centre outward, and favor voluntary organization, preserving the autonomy of each trade. In other words we prefer action to promises, deeds to words.

In the half-hour allotted to me it is impossible to present more than a general outline of a subject that is more important in its bearing and influences on human progress than all other questions combined. Yet, at the risk of preventing myself from the opportunity of a better presentation of our cause, I feel it incumbent upon me to briefly refer to the question of strikes.

Generally, the view is held that strikes form the sum total of the efforts and results of the Trade-union movement, when, as a matter of fact, a strike is but one of the manifestations of it. A strike necessarily exhibiting an antagonism, and being a public act, it attracts general attention, and, whether successful in attaining the purpose for which it was inaugurated or otherwise, a judgment is formed: it is praised or condemned according to the result. But should strikes be condemned by thinking people? Together

with those who love their fellow-men and who endeavor to aid in the solution of this great labor question, I believe that strikes should be avoided whenever and wherever possible. I ask myself, however, and I ask you, Will denunciation of strikes prevent them? Should the workers suffer their already scant means to be curtailed? Would you advise them to bear all the taskmaster's oppression, his insults and injustices, without protest? Shall the natural desire for improvement in his social and economic condition be curbed upon the only ground that he is a wealth-producer,—a worker? I say, No,—a thousand times No! Rather would we suffer the pangs of hunger for a time, when we are convinced that our temporary pain will give us at least a little relief from the overbearing tyranny, and a better opportunity to help in the struggle for amelioration in the condition and final emancipation of the toiling masses. Thanks to our trades unions, however, through the accumulation of a good fund in our treasuries, we need not enter into a strike as often as we otherwise would be compelled to, in order to resist oppression or secure improved conditions; nor need we suffer the pangs of hunger when engaged in a strike.

Strikes, as I have said, are but one of the manifestations—ay, only the outward manifestations—of the Trades union movement. Inquire from corporations and employers generally. Apply for the information from the Bureaus of Labor Statistics or the Trade unions, and, with strange accord, answers will come that the greatest work is accomplished, and that matters of wages, hours, rules, and other conditions of labor, are secured without resort to strikes. These concessions, wrested from the employing and capitalistic class every day, are ever going on, unheeded and unheralded, and form the great evolutionary force that builds up and develops a sturdy and a nobler manhood.

I have used the word "combatants." Such, indeed, we are, in all that the word implies. Against us we find arrayed a host guarded by special privilege, buttressed by legalized trusts, fed by streams of legalized monopolists, picketed by gangs of legalized "Pinkertons," and having in reserve thousands of embryo employers who, under the name of "Militia," are organized, uniformed, and armed for the sole purpose of holding the discontented in subservient bondage to iniquitous conditions. Already in many States the skirmish lines have met, again illustrating the fundamental fact of all progressive civilization: that the battle formerly

drawn between religious and political opponents is, in our time, to be fought to a finish upon purely economic grounds. And in these sporadic skirmishes we again face old foes in new uniforms; the oppressor relying upon militant measures, which differ only in kind from those maintained by his mediæval prototype, the male baronial lord,—while the oppressed, forced by adverse circumstance to unite for self-protection, calmly present a solid front, and refuse to do their enemies' bidding.

Combatants? Yes, self-defence is ever a virtue, and only such acts as are forced upon us do we accept; but it is a contest in which the Industrial Army knows no surrender. It is needless to dilate upon the time-worn calumny that we are opposing Capital. On the contrary, we only regret that Capital is so hedged in with monopolistic privilege, utilized to oppress, that the toiler is forced into economic subjection to its legalized holders. Trusting to the valiant spirit of the Industrial Army, a spirit born of the everlasting *Zeitgeist*,—the genius of the age,—knowing that we are carrying the standard for which men in all ages have suffered exile, imprisonment, and death by rack and stake and gibbet,—we still press on, holding a higher vantage-ground than ever in the past, and determined to "fight it out on this line" till the last enemy of industrial freedom is routed, and economic emancipation secured to a free and independent people, who, knowing their rights, will dare defend them against lords of either high or low degree.

While mistakes may be made and too often hasty action taken, as is ever the case in great contests, it is not our duty to carry aid and comfort to the enemy by prematurely condemning our over-zealous videttes. The struggle, as I have tried to show, is not of to-day only, but the bequest of time; and in taking up the burden laid upon us we should ever, while protecting our present interests, have the glorious vision of the future which even the present organization of the American Federation of Labor but dimly outlines.

Finally, unity of action we have; determination and grit have been manifested; fixity of purpose is our bond of federated union. What more do we require? Nothing but to maintain the same zeal and an intensified earnestness in the knowledge of the justice and ultimate success of our common cause, when

"Each man finds his own in all men's good,
And all men work in noble brotherhood."

Then, paraphrasing the words of a popular play,

"The World is Ours."

3. TRADES-UNIONS AND WAGES.

BY PROFESSOR JEREMIAH W. JENKS, OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

It is too late in the nineteenth century for one to doubt the right of existence of trades-unions, or to discuss the question of their success or failure. All such questions have been settled both in the Old World and the New; and we know that trades-unions are one of the conditions of business, one of the facts of industrial society to-day. It may still, however, be worth our while, inasmuch as the trades-unions throughout the world have not yet succeeded in attaining fully their purposed ends, to attempt to forecast in some slight degree what it is possible for them to accomplish, and especially to note under what conditions their success is to be attained, and what the interest of society, as a whole, is to be in this success.

We may fairly pass by without consideration what the condition of laborers might be if the productive capital were in the hands of the State, and the product of capital and labor were divided according to some ideal socialistic system. Whatever interest such plans may have, and however suggestive, especially from an ethical standpoint, they may be, for the present and for the immediate future, at least, they are of little practical value.

It is also beside the immediate purpose of this paper to discuss at any length the possibilities open to workingmen through co-operative and profit-sharing enterprises. It may be said, however, that as fast as employers, on the one hand, are willing to make an earnest attempt to educate their men industrially and to trust them sufficiently to enable them to show of what mettle they are made, profit-sharing is destined to play a great rôle in business enterprises requiring large capital; while, on the other hand, in industries requiring little capital, co-operation is to bring into far more thrifty circumstances the laborers who have the sobriety and self-control and unselfishness to use to advantage the tool that it puts into their hands. Trades-unions are doing something in this line already. In this field, however, a beginning only has been made; and trades-unions might do much good by seeing to it that their

members learn just what has been done and under what conditions. Few unions would do well, possibly, in starting productive co-operative enterprises; but not a few unions have in their membership many who could be trained to a better system than the present one by full knowledge of what has been accomplished in co-operation.

But, after all, the trades-unions were established and exist to-day with especial reference to the wages system and to the relations existing between employers and workingmen; and, while we may recognize the good that is done by the sick benefits, insurance funds, etc., it still remains the chief purpose of the unions to put their members on an equality with their employers in the discussion of any question affecting wages, and to secure higher wages and shorter hours of labor whenever opportunity offers, as well as to get whatever other benefits are attainable in the way of safer and more comfortable working conditions. Let us then attempt to trace briefly the general principles that determine the possible success of the unions in their efforts to raise wages or to shorten the hours of labor, and that show upon whom the burden of these increased wages must fall, if upon any one.

Writers from the trades-unions' standpoint are accustomed to call attention to the very material increase in the wages of laborers throughout the civilized world during the past twenty-five years as a proof of the efficiency of the unions. Writers on the other side deny that the unions have brought about the increase, but ascribe it rather to "natural agencies"; *i.e.*, particularly to the increased productivity of labor that comes from improved machinery and improved methods of production. Doubtless both sides are in part right. Wages could not have risen so much, had it not been for the increased productivity of labor (for, say what we may about the theory of distribution, the productivity of the laborer is still the decisive element in determining his wages); but, again, had it not been for the pressure that the trades-unions have brought to bear upon the employers, the increased productiveness would have manifested itself in lower prices—as it has done, indeed, in good part—rather than in higher wages. The trades-unions deserve the credit, doubtless, of putting a greater pressure upon the employer in many an instance than did his competitors, and consequently of securing for their members wealth that otherwise would have gone to consumers.

An increase in wages must come from one of three sources:

from the profits of the employer ; from the pockets of the consumer, in the higher prices he pays for his product ; or from the workingman himself, as he produces more by making his work more efficient. Advocates of trades-unions, so far as my observation goes, are very apt to overestimate the richness of the first source of supply and to underestimate the third, while the second is not carefully considered.

It is natural that workingmen dealing directly with wealthy employers, and often in a contest with them, should feel that the employers are putting into their own pockets wrongfully large sums of money that might as well be divided among the workingmen ; but, in reality, this is the case only rarely. It is generally true that profits in the strict sense of the word—the world over—are small and are gradually decreasing. The employers of labor are not very common who are making out of their business more than a fair rate of interest on the capital invested and fair wages for their own work of superintendence. The few that make more than this are in great part, if not entirely, offset by the many that are making less. So far, then, as unions hope for any great increase of wages to be taken from employers' profits, they will be disappointed. And yet they will do well to watch for just this source of increased wages ; for it will frequently lead to good returns from the second one mentioned, the consumers.

Employers are always glad to increase their profits, even for a short time ; and they are slow to increase wages until it is necessary. "I should have to increase my superintendent's wages to \$2,500 a year if he asked for it," said a large employer of labor to me some months since ; "but, so long as he doesn't know what he is worth, I shall not take the pains to enlighten him." The same feeling holds, naturally enough, with reference to all the grades of workingmen. When a strong demand for goods sets in and prices rise, profits of course increase also. But they will not long remain high. Unless the workingmen, by an insistent demand at the right time, secure the surplus, competition among the employers will soon force prices and profits down, and there will be no surplus. But, if a union is broad enough in its membership so that a demand for increased wages will strike all alike, the laborers, by a vigorous demand, can secure a good part of this surplus,—not indeed permanently, at the cost of the employers, for their large profits would soon cease anyway,—but rather at the cost of the consumers ; for, the cost of production being increased by the rise in

wages, prices will remain higher than would otherwise have been the case. Part of the increase, to be sure, has come from profits; but the permanent source of the higher wages is the permanently higher prices.

And this leads to a brief consideration of the influence of employers' unions, or of trusts and combines, on the wages question. While, of course, as has been said, employers are not likely voluntarily to raise the wages of their workingmen, it is nevertheless true that an employer who is making good profits is generally willing to accede to a reasonable request of his men, if he can do so with safety. Or, at any rate, to speak well within the mark, he will increase wages rather than bring on a conflict. If, however, he thinks that the high prices which are bringing him his good profits are only temporary, and that his competitors will soon bring them down, he cannot afford to increase wages unless his competitors do likewise. Now, an employers' union, while it has stronger resisting power against a laborers' union, has also a much greater influence over prices than has a single employer; and wages might, in some instances, be more easily raised throughout a whole district, in a certain industry, than by two or three employers acting alone. A striking instance of this kind occurred some three or four years ago, when the Whiskey Trust, that had secured practical control of the market, readily raised the prices that they paid for barrels and coal, so that the wages of coopers and miners might be increased. Before the formation of the trust, prices, and in consequence wages, had been so low that strikes and labor disturbances were frequent. The coopers and miners testify that the trust voluntarily gave them terms that were not and could not be granted by individual distillers. It may well be that the desire of the trust to stand well with the public, on account of the popular outcry against combinations, had something to do with the readiness with which the increase was granted; but the important fact is that the trust was in a condition to grant a request that individual competitors would have been compelled to refuse, even at the risk of a strike.

A sufficiently strong combination of workingmen could often, then, much more readily get concessions from a combination that has, in good part, control of the market than from individuals. The same fact appears, in a somewhat different way, when we consider the origin of the courts of arbitration and agreement that in England, under the leadership of Mr. Mundella in Nottingham

and of Mr. Rupert Kettle in Wolverhampton, have worked so successfully. Such courts—that have effectually done away with strikes, not one having occurred since their establishment—presuppose a strong combination of laborers on the one hand and of employers on the other, in order that wages may be regulated throughout a locality for several or all competing employers, and also that the pressure of a common public sentiment may be brought to bear to enforce the decision of the courts.

It will readily be seen that the trades-unions, in fact, will find it impossible to force up their wages to any material extent with the prospect of holding them, unless there is united action from some reason or other on the part of employers also. Without this, competition would bankrupt the man who first made concessions. The extent of this united action of employers will of course depend upon the nature of the business. Bakers, butchers to some extent, and all those whose products are for local consumption, have practical control of their market, and only those of the locality need unite; while such trades as the iron trade, sugar-refining, distilling, etc., extend throughout the country, and in many cases have to deal with foreign competition as well, so that in many instances a combination of all the employers in the country might not be able to control the prices of their products, and consequently to make concessions to wage-earners. It should not be forgotten, also, that, even where employers have control of the market, they may not be able to meet the demands of laborers, however strongly they might desire to do so. An increase in prices would frequently so reduce consumption that the net income would be lessened, and wages would have to be lowered instead of raised. A monopoly of the necessities of life might in this way work benefit to employers and laborers, when a monopoly of some luxury could have no such effect.

It is, then, often possible for trades-unions to secure an increase of wages that is, for a short time, paid from a fund that would otherwise go to profits. It is also possible for them, especially if there is a union of employers, or concerted action among them without formal union, to get increased wages that are in reality paid by the consumers; but the extent of the increase will seldom be great at any one time, and will always, in even the most favorable cases, be limited by the effect of the increased price upon the demand for the goods.

But now, before taking up the question of the interest of society

in these different cases, let us note briefly the third source of increased wages; *i.e.*, the increased productivity of the laborers themselves. I am persuaded that the trades-unions have a field here that they can cultivate more than is at present done, with really excellent results.

One of the chief sources of complaint on the part of employers is that laborers are careless, think little of saving, and show little forethought, even when they cannot be said to be unfaithful. This carelessness occasions much direct loss, besides being the source of a greatly increased expenditure for superintendence. Employers would willingly increase wages for greater care or diligence if the result appeared in the product. The experiments in profit-sharing show how great this saving may be. For some years the Pillsburys, the great millers in Minneapolis, have divided all their profits above a certain fixed percentage among their most faithful and responsible employees. This has amounted to an increase of wages by about one-third in a number of years; and they say that they make money by so doing. The increased care and diligence of the men earn it all, and more. Many firms that have adopted the system of profit-sharing testify to a similar experience. In Australia, in a number of instances, the change from a ten-hour day to an eight-hour day was accomplished without lessening the product and with practically no increase in the number of hands. In no case, perhaps, was the increase in the number of hands proportionate to the reduction in time. The men worked with greater care and energy. A prominent lumber firm in Cleveland pays its yard men, unskilled laborers, who are simply handling lumber, not all at the same rate, but at rates varying from \$1.00 to \$1.50 a day, the wages depending upon the general character of the man as a laborer. If a man is dissatisfied because his wages are less than those of another doing the same kind of work, he is told to watch his fellow's work, and that as soon as he does as much and does it as well, his wages will be made equal. Men working in a factory, where machinery sets the rate of speed in good part, and where most careful supervision reduces waste to a minimum, could increase their product least, though here even much might be done; but any one who watches men engaged in labor knows well enough that by extra diligence and care in very many cases they could do more, even twenty-five per cent. more, frequently, without injury to themselves, if they only willed it. Under present conditions, with dissatisfied feelings toward their employer, instead of trying to in-

crease their efficiency, they frequently are rather careful not to earn more than their wages. They cannot, perhaps, under existing conditions, will to do more and better work; but, if their employers could be sure they would do this more efficient work, they would gladly pay the higher wages. Unions could at least make more of an attempt to educate their members in this line than they have done. I have known of one case—among skilled workmen in a planing mill—where the mere presence and general guidance of a boss at times added one-half to the work done when he was not present. Employers say that it is next to impossible to find a man as boss who knows what a fair day's work is and who can get men to do it. And yet each man ought to know that (what a fair day's work is) for himself and to be willing to do it. Even the wages question, it seems, is a moral question at bottom. Neither party is quite faithful enough to be willing to trust the other. The laborer will work better in most cases when his wages are raised, we know. He ought to be willing to work better to get his wages raised; and, again, employers, as was said in connection with profit-sharing, might wisely trust their men much oftener than they do in this respect.

The question of an eight-hour day, of course, involves these same principles. Unless by their greater freshness and intelligence in work, as a result of their greater leisure, the men add to their efficiency enough to compensate for the two hours lost, the loss in time has to be borne either by the employers or by the public at large. In few cases only and for short times will the employers carry the burden. They will rather be able to pass it on to the consumers. The unions will be able to carry out this reform—if we call it a reform—only by having the grace or the strength, as the case may be, to increase their efficiency to this extent or to compel the public, through their employers, to furnish this extra pay in relatively higher prices. Probably the burden will be, in the main, divided. The increased pressure of a threatened strike doubtless increases the efficiency of employers also, frequently; but laborers usually take to themselves and the influence of their unions too much credit for improvements in machinery and other improvements in methods of production made by their employers. An employer is always looking for the opportunity to lessen the cost of production. A threatened strike or an increase in wages may add a little extra stimulus; but the desire and effort are always present. [It should perhaps be noted that,

when "higher prices" are spoken of, the expression may not mean prices higher than they were before the increase of wages or shortening of hours, but rather prices higher than they would have been without this change in wages or hours. The change may simply prevent a lowering of prices.]

And now, briefly, what interest has society as a whole in these various ways by which through the influence of trades-unions wages may be increased or hours of labor lessened?

It is frequently argued — and with some plausibility — that it is for the economic interest of society that, after the workingmen have sufficient wages to enable them to maintain a standard of life that will keep them healthy, any further surplus should remain in the hands of the employers as profits; for, it is said, employers will invest their capital profitably, while workingmen, having each only a small sum, will expend it in useless luxuries, — practically waste it. The charge is doubtless often true; and, if it were generally so, it would be against the interest of society for workingmen to receive increased wages at the expense of the employers. But, on the other hand, employers also frequently expend large sums in useless and wasteful luxury; and, again, whatever part of the wages of workingmen is placed in savings-banks, or is expended by themselves productively, is economically as well spent as if it were invested by the employer, while all that goes to elevate their standard of life, intellectually or æsthetically or morally, is from the social standpoint more wisely expended. Now, there is reason to believe that this last class of expenditure by workingmen is rapidly increasing, and that, as wages continue to increase, it will grow in a still greater proportion; and especially is it probably true that trades-unions, though they might wisely do more, do still exert a powerful influence in this direction. If so, it is certainly best that wages be increased, so far as may be, even at the expense of the employer, so long, of course, as he is not forced into bankruptcy.

And, even when the increase of wages is paid by the consumer in higher prices, the same thing will be true in most cases. So far, of course, as the laborer himself is a consumer of his own product, this increase in the price of the goods will lessen the increase in his real wages; but a part of the goods produced by the labor of members of trades-unions are consumed by others, and frequently, usually perhaps, by classes better able to pay higher prices. So far, then, an increase in wages paid in higher

prices tends toward a more equal distribution of wealth, and that in a way that is natural and normal. On the other side, of course, we shall at times find consumers burdened by the higher prices who are, on the whole, less able to bear them than the unionists themselves. This is relatively rarely the case. A general rise in wages (if we may suppose a case that in actual life, if realized at all, comes only very gradually) that is thus paid in higher prices would result, it may be seen, in a transfer of a part of the wealth of other classes to the wage-earners; for the other classes consume always a part, though perhaps a relatively small part of the product. In this instance, then, so far as the workingmen make as wise a use of their increase in wages as would the general mass of consumers,—and this is generally the case, doubtless,—society as a whole is also benefited by the increase in wages, though many individuals will suffer. The ideal industrial condition, then, for the wage-earners—and I am not at all sure that it would not prove to be best, too, for society as a whole, as the wage-earners make up so large a part of it—would be monopoly prices, with wages high enough to keep profits at a minimum.

An increase in wages, now, that comes from increased efficiency of the workingmen, has no drawback at all. Indeed, not only are the workingmen themselves benefited without injury to any one else, but the increased capital thus produced will have a tendency still farther to increase their own wages and those of their fellows.

If the foregoing analysis of the sources of an increase of wages and of the amount that it is possible for workingmen to achieve by acting through trades-unions is correct, surely the field of achievement is great enough. Under ideal conditions, it includes but little less than the entire increase in production of an advancing civilization, from whatever source this increase may come, while it also shows us that workingmen have it continually within their power to add directly to this increase in production. But we can only reflect that as yet trades-unions are far from their ideal condition, though we may also note that they are surely and steadily working thitherward. To enable trades-unions to reach forward more rapidly toward this continued increase in wages,—which, indeed, as was intimated at first, really includes in itself all the other social and moral benefits that trades-unions seek by their union,—they need, first of all, to have at their command, though, of course, not every member of the union need possess it, a business knowledge and judgment equal to that of their em-

ployers. It is encouraging to note that unions are more and more getting this knowledge, and that in some of the best equipped unions, in lines of business where market reports are regular and available, the relations between prices and wages and profits are thoroughly understood by the members, to their great advantage, as well as to the safety of the employers. Such a knowledge enables them to take advantage promptly of increased prices or of reduced cost of production, while it at the same time prevents them from foolishly precipitating unnecessary conflicts, as has been so frequently done.

But for the best success of the unions, in the long run, it is also desirable that the employers be associated. When both parties are well organized, we may first look for the settlement and prevention of disputes between them by courts of arbitration and agreement, that shall render full justice to laborers without oppressing employers or checking the productivity of either, as is now so frequently the case. It is interesting and pleasing to note that this condition, too, sometimes from one purpose, sometimes from another, is also coming.

But before harmonious action of the two classes can be expected there is yet much conflict before them in this country. The trades-unions should not forget that in no way can they prevent these conflicts so well as by the exhibition of moral force and energy that shall convince employers that they are really trustworthy in the fullest sense of the word : in no way can they so readily increase their wages as by deliberately increasing their productivity ; and I should perhaps add that for this result greater care and faithfulness are required rather than greater speed or strength. Furthermore, it is equally certain that, where conflict is inevitable, in the attainment of their cherished ends of higher wages or shorter hours, this same moral energy and will is requisite in other ways. The tendency of the present day is to rely too much upon legislation, too little upon one's own efforts. If there is one lesson that the history of trades-unions teaches more emphatically than any other, it is this of self-reliance. In the past their influence toward raising wages, toward shortening hours of labor, toward elevating themselves in all ways, has been gained, even the recognition of their very right to existence has been secured, not by relying upon legislatures, though at times they have been useful, but by fixing their will upon one just end at a time, and making what sacrifices might be necessary to accomplish that. In Australia, to get an

eight-hour day, they had at times to take lower wages, and they took them, to accomplish what they considered a higher purpose, trusting to the future to regain them, which they also did. As it has been in the past, so it will be in the future. The possibilities of trades-unions are great; but the victories will be won only through long struggle, and then only when well merited and well earned by daily faithfulness and daily care. And this is right.

"He only earns his freedom and existence
Who daily conquers them anew."

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ORGANIZED INDUSTRY.

BY FREDERICK J. KINGSBURY, OF WATERBURY, CT.

The literature of Labor Organization is so extensive, and the subject has become so specialized in treatment, that it seemed to me difficult to say anything in regard to it, within the limits of the time at my disposal, which should be worth presenting, unless I could confine what I had to say to some one point or aspect of the question. And, therefore, it has occurred to me that I might occupy a few minutes not unprofitably by recapitulating, mainly from my own recollection, some of the changes that have taken place in the development of a single industry. It is changes of this sort which have rendered possible, if they have not made necessary, the modern labor organization.

I have taken for this purpose the business of the manufacture of boots and shoes, showing, perhaps, as marked changes as any, although the history of the manufacture of several other articles, as, for instance, hats and clothing, would be very similar.

Sixty years ago nothing that could be called machinery was in use in the manufacture of shoes, and ready-made shoes, as an article of trade, were but little known. Every village had its shoemaker, who supplied every grade and variety desired. He measured the customer's foot, drawing his sharp knife in what seemed dangerous proximity to the boys' toes, commonly using for a measure folded strips of paper, whose dimensions were afterwards transferred, by cabalistic signs, to the order book. He prepared the last, by divers piecings and parings, to suit the idiosyncrasy of the individual foot. He selected from his stock the leather suitable for the purpose. He furnished all the material and he did all the work, except the binding, which was done by the women of his own or his neighbor's family, and thus laid the foundation of many a small fortune, as well as of some very respectable poetry.

He not only furnished the leather and made the shoe, but he prepared much of what might be regarded as his raw material. He made his own wax, boiling the tar and resin out of doors, in an

iron kettle, upon an extemporized stone fireplace, dexterously smothering it with his lap-board when it took fire, which it was very apt to do. He boiled his own rye-flour paste, watching and stirring it, to prevent its burning, until just the right consistency was attained. He sawed his own peg blocks, selecting therefor a piece of fine and straight-grained sugar maple, from which the pegs were deftly split with diamond-shaped heads, and sharpened as required. He made his own waxed thread, twisted of many strands, and terminated by a bristle, which was skilfully split and intertwined with, and then passed through, the thread to preserve the twist. He made his own blacking, both liquid and solid, and doubtless did many other things which I have forgotten, but which then constituted part of the art and mystery of a shoemaker's trade.

In agricultural communities, where the population was sparse and the dwellings isolated, it was the custom to have the shoes for the family made in the house. For this purpose the shoemaker went about from house to house, remaining in each family until its work was done. These men who went from house to house were known as "cat-whippers." But this name was not peculiar to shoemakers: it was also applied to tailors who went about in a similar manner, and perhaps to people of other trades. It was the method, and not the calling, to which the phrase was applied. Of its origin or meaning I know nothing. The workman's tools were called a kit, but I do not believe any relation existed between the "cat" and the "kit." Two such visits a year usually kept the family sufficiently well shod. The materials in this case were not supplied by the shoemaker, but by the person for whom the work was done. The leather, perhaps, was that made from the hides of animals which he had raised and slaughtered for his own use, the skin of which had been subsequently sent to the neighboring tannery, there to be tanned into such leather as might be required for family use; and the other materials were procured as occasion required. This sort of life presents to us a picture of independent interdependence which is not lacking in idyllic simplicity, whatever else may be said for or against it.

The located village shoemakers, especially in the small villages, generally did their work in their own houses, and frequently cultivated a small farm, to which they gave the necessary labor during the summer months, and followed shoemaking during the remainder of the year; sometimes utilizing their time by making a few shoes for sale, which were disposed of to neighboring merchants.

After a while certain enterprising persons began the manufacture of shoes for sale in the market as a business, the Southern States at that time furnishing the principal market. These manufacturers were scattered about in various country towns, which thus became centres for this particular industry. They had usually a central shop where a number of hands were employed where the cutting was done and the work given out and received when completed. The greater portion of the work was given out to people who worked in their own homes. But the inauguration of this method of manufacture quickly led to a division of labor. Individuals developed aptitudes for special kinds of work, and it was found that a man working constantly in one particular branch could accomplish more than when he attempted all departments. Some were employed upon fine boots, others on those of a coarser grade; and in boots alone there were usually at least three grades.

The same division held in men's shoes and the same in women's; while pumps, slippers, and children's shoes, known in the language of the trade as "cacks," each had a department to themselves. The next step was separating the different parts and processes of the same boot or shoe, so that now crimpers, lasters, closers, binders, and bottomers were developed as separate industries for the several classes above named; and it soon came to pass that they became really separate trades, in which no one workman fully understood, or was expert in any but his own department, and the services of all were necessary to complete a single boot or shoe. I may have omitted some of these processes which came to be regarded as separate trades; but, taking those I have enumerated, it shows a total of sixty persons employed in producing a result which was formerly produced by one. This takes no account of the manufacture of wax, paste, blacking, and pegs, each of which became a separate department. Under proper management, however, these sixty persons probably produced considerably more than sixty times as many shoes as were produced by one in the old method, at a cost to the consumer certainly of no more, and with a compensation to the workman, on the average, greater.

This state of the trade continued until the introduction of the sewing-machine, and its application to the manufacture of boots and shoes. This to a great extent revolutionized the business, and put it on the footing of strict factory work. So far as the consumer is concerned, but little change seems to have taken place. I am not an expert, but I should say that the price of the

same quality of boots and shoes is not materially different from what it was fifty years ago. Shoes are, on the whole, as good and no better than they were then. I seem to remember a period, say about thirty years ago, probably a little before the war, when good shoes could be purchased for less money than at any time before or since. But this fact, if it be a fact, was probably due to causes temporary in their nature and having no special bearing on the history of the industry.

Now, I desire to speak with modesty, and to admit that my opportunity for intimate acquaintance with the operatives of the shoe factories is limited (never having lived where this was a leading industry); but, from such observation as I have had and from such knowledge as I have been able to gain in other ways, I am decidedly of opinion that the change which I have just recounted has been accompanied, nearly *pari passu*, by a deterioration of the workmen employed in the business—in character, in social position, in morals, and relatively in comfort of living, as compared with those who live best in the same community, notwithstanding that the wages received for time spent or labor performed are greater—I should say much greater—and the hours of labor are certainly very much less.

In those earlier times of which I have spoken, when the village shoemaker had his bench in his own home and supplied the wants of his neighbors, although there was "odds" in shoemakers, as it has always been admitted that there is liable to be in deacons, the social position of many of these shoemakers was as good as that of anybody in the community in which they lived. They were the deacons of the churches, sometimes, indeed, the local preachers, justices of the peace, grand jurymen, town clerks, selectmen, school committees, members of the legislature, militia officers, captains, majors, colonels, and generals. They sent their sons to college, their daughters to academies and schools of high grade. Their lives were plain and simple, but so were the lives of all about them. They read and they thought. The shoemaker's shop of those days was a school of politics and theology. A man could hammer out a sole while he discussed the five points of Calvinism, and accentuate each conclusion in his argument by an extra hard blow of his hammer; while a heated discussion of General Jackson's attitude toward "The Bank" was apt to result in the rupture of the thread of a shoe, if not in the thread of an argument.

Neither was science disregarded. The latest books on astronomy, geology, and such other sciences as were then attracting attention, were read with avidity, and discussed in the shoemaker's shop with intelligence. Many a distinguished man, in the pulpit, at the bar, or in the scientific professions, began his education in the workshop, and could doubtless trace his first mental expansion and intellectual stimulus to these homely discussions over the daily task. To the boys of the neighborhood the shoemaker's shop, in the long winter evenings, was the gymnasium (in the German sense), the school of technology and applied science, the club and the university, all in one. There they covered their balls and made their slings; there they saw old journeymen crack hickory nuts on their naked knees; there they sharpened their wits on arithmetical puzzles and historical conundrums, and listened to political and theological discussions, and to more or less true tales of Revolutionary battles and personal adventure; there they played checkers, "fox-and-geese," and "twelve-men's-morris," marking the forms for these latter games with chalk upon a lap-board, and playing with black and yellow corn, the black being the yellow smoked in the lamp. Doubtless they saw and learned a good many things not absolutely essential to their mental and moral development, but, on the whole, not much harm was done; and, if there is within the sound of my voice a man who was raised in the neighborhood of a shoemaker's shop of the old-fashioned kind, I am not in the least afraid to appeal to him to say whether some of the most profitable, as well as pleasantest, of his youthful hours were not spent within its walls,—not counting in, either, the hickory nuts, cider, and roasted apples that helped to lubricate the ways of knowledge. Even now I fancy that I can smell the oil-lamps as the workman picked them up with his awl. Neither was discipline wanting. The shoemaker's strap had its wholesome virtues, and there was not the slightest hesitation in using it whenever occasion seemed to demand. The connection between wrong-doing and punishment was not apt to be lost sight of for want of object-lessons.

Now, the workmen of to-day can get almost without price books and lectures and means of instruction such as these men never dreamed of. He has better clothes and more of them; his children have opportunities for better instruction; he lives in a better house, and he probably has more and better things to eat. He certainly has more to drink; and he has more amusements, games,

shows, plays, and diversions of all sorts. Why is he not as much of a man and as valuable a citizen as his prototype? Dr. Harris has, on a former occasion, pointed out to us how a minute division of hand-labor tends to deterioration in the workman, while in machine-work the contrary result may be expected. I should say, from observation, that the deterioration in this case began with the subdivision of labor. Perhaps it came from that, and there has not been time for the reaction under the factory system. I wish to say, however, that I have no confidence myself in the value of that suggestion.

I have an impression, too, that the class of men who have been brought to the front as managers and employers of labor, captains of industry, have been more conspicuous for their energy and success than for a broad general intelligence. I would not have it inferred, however, that this remark is more applicable to this than to other industries which our modern civilization has developed.

The workman under the old *régime* was not by any means always satisfied nor entirely happy. He wanted more than he got, and he grumbled because he did not get it. If, however, a strike or a hostile combination had been suggested as a remedy, he would have quoted Æsop, and said that he was not such a fool as to kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. I am not saying that he would have been right in his argument. It is history that I am trying to write.

Does the workman of to-day come, on the whole, from a less intelligent and intellectually developed portion of the community than formerly? So far as he is an American, and except to the extent that the very process I am speaking of may have lowered his standard, I should say, No! So far as he is a foreigner, probably, Yes! It is also to be noted that, while our present hours of labor are shorter, our work is more intense than formerly. In the modern workroom there is no time or opportunity for discussion or conversation. There is no leisure for amusing or instructing boys. Boys themselves, except as workers, are not permitted. There are no arguments, no studies, no puzzles, no problems. No play is mingled with the work, nothing that tends to expand the faculties or broaden the mental outlook beyond the thing in hand. The workman becomes less of a man and more of a machine.

May not this be at least a partial solution of the change? And, if it is, may not organization do something in the way of counter-acting or counterbalancing this tendency? To see the nature

and seat of the evil is to suggest the remedy. Restore the social feature,—not *in* the workshop (for that is no longer possible), but *out* of it, in the holiday and the evening club ; and let the object be to replace the thing which has been lost,—namely, cheerful conversation, intelligent discussion, sympathy with the rising generation ; a pure and intelligent interest in boys, their pastimes and their training. In some such way as this perhaps it may be possible to replace what we have lost,—the moral, social, and educational training of the old handicraft workshop. It is certainly worth getting back again at any reasonable cost.

5. "WISDOM IS BETTER THAN WEAPONS OF WAR."—*Ecclesiastes*.

BY MRS. C. R. LOWELL, OF NEW YORK.

There are civilized and uncivilized methods of settling all disputes that arise between men. Two neighbors, whose daily happiness depends very much upon their relations to each other, may choose any one of four courses when their interests seem to clash.

1. They may talk over their common affairs in a friendly spirit, each anxious to be just and to give due weight to the arguments of his neighbor; and with mutual good-will and forbearance they will settle any question which may arise between them, not only without any breach of their friendship but with added respect and affection for each other, and it will each day become more difficult for them to quarrel on account of the mutual confidence which their closer acquaintance has engendered.

2. They may submit a question in dispute to the decision of a common friend, and may accept in good faith his decision; and their relation will be improved by this experience also, if each has shown a desire that justice should be done.

3. They may go to law, but they will not love each other the better for that.

4. They may fight it out, in which case the weaker is likely to be beaten, regardless of the justice of his cause, and they will hate each other, welcome every means to annoy each other, and will be very likely to fight again whenever a chance offers.

The first three may be classified as civilized methods of settling a difference: the last is certainly uncivilized. All four methods have been used to settle disputes between Capital and Labor.

Strikes and lockouts are the "fight it out" method, which usually decides nothing except the relative strength of the combatants for the moment, and tends to leave both sides angry and bitter and ready to try again upon any or no pretext. The exception is when the fight has been so desperate, so nearly a fight to the death, that both sides are exhausted, and are convinced at last

that uncivilized methods are also unwise methods ; in which case the strike and lockout will have performed so good a part, will have taught so good a lesson, that those particular men will turn to one or other of the civilized methods of settling their differences, and the strike and lockout in that particular trade will be a thing of the past. Strikes and lockouts are sometimes necessary, as it is sometimes necessary to knock a man down before he will listen to reason.

Of the civilized methods which have been tried, the procedure of the official Courts of Arbitration of France, the "Conseils des Prud'hommes," amounts practically to settlement by law, and is an immense improvement on the strike and lockout. These Courts, of which there are now 136 in France, settled about 42,000 disputes in 1890. They are composed of an equal number of employers and workmen, and their decisions are binding.

Good as they are, however, the voluntary Boards of Arbitration in England seem to be still better, because they are voluntary, and require, therefore, the exercise of nobler qualities, both in the men who compose them and in those who abide by their decisions. They, like the French "Conseils," are composed of an equal number of employers and workmen, who submit the question in dispute to an umpire. Such Boards have prevented strikes and lockouts, in some of the largest trades, for years.

The Boards of Conciliation are, however, superior to all other means so far tried for maintaining peace between Capital and Labor, and require also a superior class of men to carry them on ; for there must be a real love of justice on both sides, and the strongest determination to allow no petty feelings, no personal or class jealousies, to destroy the good understanding which must exist between the representatives of the two parties interested.

The Boards of Conciliation are only a means by which the matters of mutual interest to employers and employed — not yet having become matters of difference — may be talked over in a friendly spirit, with the object of *preventing* trouble. Their great value lies in the fact that meetings are held when there are no difficulties to be settled, and therefore when there is no antagonism. They are composed of equal numbers of employers and employed, who meet at regular intervals to hear questions submitted to them from either side. Mr. Mundella, M.P., who founded the first Board of Conciliation (as distinct from a Board of Arbitration) in his own trade of hosiery, in 1860, speaks thus of the result : * —

* Boards of Conciliation in Labor Disputes. By J. Samuelson. 1891.

"Strikes and lockouts are unknown. Contact has developed respect. The changed relation of employer and employed has been recognized. They have met at the same table as equals, and out of this has grown a condition of affairs that will make it impossible for the old conditions to return."

Mr. Mundella attributes the changed relations to the regular quarterly meetings of the Board.

Almost all the Boards established within the past twenty years, in England, have been "Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration"; that is, they provide for an appeal to an umpire in case of non-agreement in the Board itself. Perhaps the most remarkably successful of these Boards is that of the North of England Iron Trade, founded in 1869, which represents thousands of men and nearly two thousand furnaces, and which for twenty-one years has prevented strikes and lockouts in a trade where they were frequent in former years. In the last Report of this Board occur the following sentences : * —

"In considering the work of the Board since its formation on March 22d, 1869, the Committee feel assured it will be granted on all hands that the organization has been of immense benefit to the district embraced within the scope of its operations. Not only has it been an advantage to those engaged in the particular trade that is more immediately concerned with its decisions and arrangements, but it has been equally beneficial to all connected with those industries which are more or less closely related thereto. . . . Whilst admitting occasional departures from the rules and from the principles which govern the Board, it may be confidently anticipated that those struggles between capital and labor which this district has witnessed in years gone by are, with an institution like your Board in operation, a thing altogether of the past."

But to an American, however interesting and encouraging may be the history of the settlement of labor differences in France and England, the vital question is, what has been accomplished in our own country towards the adoption of civilized methods, and why have any other methods ever been allowed to obtain sway here,—in the country, as we please ourselves with thinking, the foremost in its love of justice and in intelligence? I propose to myself, in writing this paper, not a pleasant task, but one which I hope may prove to be of some use. My intention is to consider certain typical cases where arbitration has been attempted in this country and has failed, and to show the underlying causes of the failure.

* Boards of Conciliation in Labor Disputes. By J. Samuelson. 1891.

Let me premise that for many years labor organizations in America have been favorably inclined towards arbitration, theoretically at least, and in their published declarations of principles; the Knights of Labor, for instance, closing their "platform of principles" with the following statement:—

"To persuade employers to agree to arbitrate all differences which may arise between them and their employees, in order that the bonds of sympathy between them may be strengthened, and that strikes may be rendered unnecessary."

The employers, on the other hand, seem usually to have no theories on this most important subject. Their practice is purely empirical. Most of them have not, so far as appears, made a study of the peaceable settlement of labor difficulties and know but little of the history of the movement; and they are usually guided by their own wish or prejudice, or at least by their own unaided intelligence, in attempting to come to a conclusion in any given case.

The qualities which are required, in order to make possible a peaceable solution of a difference between an employer and his employees, are the same as those required in the case of individual men. There must be, on both sides, a desire not only for peace, but for justice. No man, or body of men, whose only idea is to get and keep all they can wrest, by stratagem or force, from others, can, in the nature of things, be a party to the peaceable adjustment of a question involving their own rights and interests in contest with those of others. The conception of justice is impossible to such minds. They look upon brute force as the only means by which any question can be settled, and they are themselves amenable to no other motive.

To take part in the peaceful settlement of a contest, where one's own interests are to be weighed against those of another, requires an advanced moral and intellectual development. A man must be willing, and he must also be able, to see the other side; he must be ready to be convinced; he must have sufficient mind to be able to understand the arguments put forward to convince him; and he must, moreover, have faith in the honor of others and a strong sense of honor himself.* "Though he promise to his hurt," he must "keep his promise good."

*A remarkable instance of this sense of honor was shown by the men in the North of England Iron Trade, who accepted a reduction of fifty per cent. in their wages, brought about by various decisions of the Board of Arbitration, during only eighteen months. This occurred within a few years of the formation of the Board, and was a tremendous test both of the honor and consistency of the men, and also of the power of the Board to prevent strikes.

This is a *sine qua non*, of course. A settlement is no settlement which can be unsettled at once; and unless there is a belief on both sides in the intention to live up to the agreement reached, and unless experience proves that the intention will be carried out, of course the first experiment in arbitration will also be the last, at least for a time, and until the necessary conditions have been created. One of the very interesting statements made concerning the Board of Arbitration of the North of England Iron Trade is that, at every hearing, each side is anxious that the other should know beforehand all the facts it has to present; also, that each side believes the statements of the other side, and believes, moreover, in the desire of the other side to do justice. This is, evidently, a very high stage of ethical development; and it is one which, although to a degree necessary, as I have said, for the first establishment of such a Board, has also been fostered by the twenty years' experience in the Board, for it is expressly stated that, in the beginning, the mutual trust was by no means of this noble character.

To repeat, besides intelligence, the moral qualities needed in the men who are to settle peaceably their differences with their fellow-men are love of justice, honor and faith. Since these, then, are the prerequisites for the successful establishment and working of Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration, it can be neither grateful to our patriotism nor pleasant to our national vanity to know that, in too many cases in our country, such Boards have been tried and have failed. It would seem that we have been neither fair enough nor honest enough to maintain them. In many other cases, methods of conciliation have succeeded with us; but, as my present office is to draw a moral from some of the failures of attempts at conciliation and arbitration, I shall leave the successes to be considered by others, expressing, however, my deepest gratitude and respect for the men, whether employers or employed, who have shown the high qualities needed to inaugurate and carry through such undertakings.

In a pamphlet issued by the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, in 1881, are to be found some very important historical sketches of attempts in different parts of the country to create machinery for the fixing of wages and the adjustment of other questions arising between employers and employed. From among these I select four, beginning with an account of what occurred in Lynn in the shoemaking trade during the years 1870, 1871, and 1872.

The Knights of St. Crispin had been organized in 1864, in Milwaukee, and within the following four years had become very powerful throughout the country, especially in Lynn, where in 1868-69 they had a very great influence, and excited much opposition on the part of the manufacturers, by their claim to control the employment and discharge of men, and to interfere in all questions between the men and their employers. I shall now quote from the report of the agent of the Massachusetts Bureau given in the pamphlet referred to, condensing his statement very much, however. His intention is to give the facts, so far as he could gather them by conversation with many manufacturers and workmen, and, also, the opinions of both sides as to the facts and the causes that led to them.

“About the spring of 1870 many manufacturers, finding it impossible to prosecute their business with any certainty of success under the vexatious, unjust, and arrogant demands of the Crispin organization, determined to endeavor, by concert, to find some means by which they might free themselves. In this they professed to be influenced, not alone by motives of self-interest, but by a sincere regard for the best interests and welfare of their workmen. They saw very clearly that, unless something was done, trade would leave the city, as no manufacturer felt safe in taking orders for goods or in entering into contracts with dealers in boots and shoes. While these matters were under consideration and before any plans had been matured, one of the most eminent manufacturers in the city, without consultation and almost entirely on his own responsibility, by means of one of his own workmen, got himself invited into a meeting of one of the Crispin lodges, and there and then made a speech in which he commended their organization and its principles. Deploring the misunderstandings between employer and employee, he pledged his word that, if they would appoint a committee of five of their number, he would see that a like number of manufacturers were appointed to meet with them and talk over matters in an amicable manner, so that, if possible, some agreement might be reached which would be mutually satisfactory. In taking this unauthorized step, this gentleman was regarded by the other manufacturers as having betrayed their cause. His action excited considerable indignation among them, and the committee of five who finally met with the Crispin committee to arrange a scale of prices was self-appointed; but, being, all of them, prominent men in the business and large employers, their influence was such as to very much strengthen and encourage the Crispin organizations. The manufacturers felt that their interests had been betrayed and their attempted union broken up; yet they were obliged, as the best they could do under the circumstances, to adopt generally the scale of prices which had been

agreed upon by the so-called committees. They were, however, none the less restive under the arrogant and arbitrary demands of the Crispins, and indignant that any employers of labor should acknowledge the right of an employee to interfere with his business.

"In justice to this gentleman, it should be stated that he felt the steps taken by him were for the best interests of all concerned. He states that he has always tried to treat his workmen as equals, and has never been intentionally oppressive. The principle of arbitration inaugurated by him he believes to be just, and that it might be made an effectual means of settling all disputes if both parties could only be prevailed upon to carry it out in good faith. He regards some union of the workingmen as necessary for the protection of their own interests, and such union is, in many other respects, likely to be more or less advantageous to them; and, though at that time there was much in the Crispin organization which he could by no means approve, it was his idea that it would have been better for the interests of the whole city if employers, by adopting a kind and forbearing policy towards the workingmen, could have established a better understanding of each other's interests; and, when by mutual consultation and mutual concessions confidence and good feeling should have obtained, it would not have been difficult to change or abolish the most objectionable provisions of the Crispin organization. . . .

"The ideas of the workingmen are various; but they may be summed up into three classes, as follows: The first class are those who do not believe in arbitration with employers, who have seen nothing but what is right in the most rigorous rules the Crispins ever adopted, and who would willingly have adopted those more stringent. . . . A second class are of the opinion that a proper system of arbitration would do much to put an end to the disagreements between employers and operatives; . . . but, they say, under existing circumstances, such a scheme is altogether impracticable. Manufacturers generally are not sincere when they talk of justice to labor. . . . The arrangements made in 1870 were only agreed to because employers could not help themselves, and they were sure to be violated whenever interest demanded.

"The third class of workingmen, though perhaps not the most numerous, hold about the same sentiments as those expressed by the manufacturers previously quoted. They state that they have always been more than ready to welcome any overtures from the manufacturers looking towards arbitration in the settlement of disputes and difficulties. . . . They have always deplored strikes, and never gave consent to one, except as a last resort. When, therefore, arbitration was proposed by a leading manufacturer, the idea was hailed by them as a long step in the right direction; and they were ready to aid it by every means in their power. A mass meeting of the lodges was held; and, after some discussion, a committee of five was appointed to confer with a like number of manufacturers. On the 21st of July, 1870, these committees

met in the Board of Trade rooms. There seems to have been no record kept of the transactions of this meeting; but members on the part of the Crispins state that it was anything but harmonious, and that more than once rupture seemed imminent. One manufacturer made a speech, in the course of which he said that, if any one had told him twenty-four hours before that he could have been persuaded to meet and treat with Crispins on any terms, he should have felt insulted. Through the exertions of a few more temperate minds, however, a better spirit finally prevailed; and after much discussion, taking up two full days, a list of prices was agreed upon and adopted, to continue in force one year. The two committees then exchanged congratulations. Speeches were made by some of the manufacturers, in which they commended the Crispin organization, and pledged themselves to rigidly adhere to the agreement made, and to use every proper means in their power to have it recognized and adopted in the trade throughout the city. After this united action, several strikes which had been previously inaugurated came at once to an end. The Crispins were jubilant, and considered they had gained a point in being recognized by employers as a body to be negotiated with on equal terms; and much confidence was expressed on all sides that at length amicable relations had been established between the manufacturers and workingmen of Lynn.

"Notwithstanding the fault found with the self-appointed committee (so called), there is no doubt that for the time being, at all events, they were successful; and the list of prices agreed upon by them was substantially that of the trade throughout the city for the next year. It is charged, however, by members of the Crispins that they could never again get that board of arbitration to meet with them, that in the settlement of difficulties which now and then arose from various causes in several of the shops they received no aid or countenance from the employers. . . . Still, it is evident that the Lynn shoe manufacturers generally considered that during this year there had been established some principle of arbitration to which they felt themselves, to a great extent at least, obliged to conform.

"At the expiration of the time agreed upon another committee of employers met with the Crispin committee of arbitration. They congratulated each other upon the success which had attended the fulfilment of the agreement just ended, the general peace and harmony which had prevailed, and the prosperous condition of the city, after which a scale of prices was agreed to and adopted for another year (to June 10, 1872), which was subsequently printed and circulated through all the shops in Lynn. It is worthy of notice that during these two years, when a fixed rate of labor had been established by this joint committee, the shoe business prospered, and the active and material growth of Lynn was the subject of frequent and flattering comment, not only in the local press, but throughout the country. . . .

"Some of the most intelligent and reliable men who in 1872

were leading and prominent members of the order of St. Crispin state that shortly before the termination of the second compact it was evident to them that certain manufacturers were determined, if possible, to prevent any further agreements of that nature, and that in the spring of that year they united, with the resolute purpose of breaking up the Crispin organization. . . . Manufacturers, on the other hand, charge that Crispinism had become perfectly unbearable; that the Crispins, elated with success and full of self-confidence, became every day more and more unreasonable in their demands; that they were continually trumping up fresh grievances, and insisting upon conditions, not only inconvenient to employees, but tending, if carried out, to drive trade from the city and ruin all concerned. . . .

"In reply, the men say that, while it must be admitted that there is some truth in the charges brought against the order, it is not the less true that employers never sincerely tried to make the best of it, but all along showed by their actions a spirit of opposition to it in any form; that, if the committee of arbitration on the part of the employers had, even partially, done as they promised, there would have been no trouble, as the workingmen were always more than willing to leave any grievance, real or supposed, to be settled by that plan; that, had employers generally shown such interest in the well-being of their employees as they all of them professed to feel, any of the unreasonable rules or laws of the Crispin order could and would have been modified or abolished. . . .

"About the middle of June, 1872 (the agreement having expired on the 10th), the following circular, signed by the Crispin committee, was sent to all the shoe-shops in the city: 'To the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers of Lynn. Gentlemen,—We the undersigned, a committee appointed by the Knights of St. Crispin, in mass convention assembled, respectfully notify you that we are prepared to meet with a similar committee of the shoe manufacturers of Lynn, with a view to arranging a list of prices for the coming year. Please inform us through our secretary of your action at as early a date as convenient.'

"To this communication no reply was ever received."

And so ended the system of conciliation in the shoe-trade of Lynn. The manufacturers formed themselves into a Union for the purpose of destroying the Union of the workingmen. The latter struck, but in vain; and the Crispin organization virtually came to an end in Lynn. It is evident from the above account, as it seems to me, that the blame for the failure of the plan of conciliation may be almost equally divided between the Knights of St. Crispin and the manufacturers. The former, by an unreasonable exercise of the power they had acquired, aroused in the

latter a spirit of vindictiveness and antagonism which was unworthy of intelligent and fair-minded men. They should, instead of indulging these feelings, have made an effort to understand their workmen, and should in good faith have seconded the efforts of the one among their number who had the wisdom, the courage, and the generosity to suggest the only means of arriving at permanent peace. To tyranny on the part of the Crispins and anger on the part of the manufacturers — that is, to selfish short-sightedness on both sides — must be attributed this disaster.

It is interesting, after considering this story of the mistakes of Lynn shoe manufacturers and workmen in 1872, to find the following words in the Report of the Massachusetts State Board of Arbitration for 1890:

... "In Marlborough, Brockton, and Whitman there have been no labor difficulties during the last year which involved serious loss of work to any one. In all these thriving centres of shoe-making enterprise, . . . the principle of arbitration has gained a foothold. . . . Is it not worth while for those who are most closely identified with the business of Lynn to consider the question whether there is not something to be learned from other shoe towns as to the best methods of dealing with questions which arise between employers and employees? . . . It ought to be possible to devise some way that would produce better results for all concerned than have been witnessed in Lynn during the last year."

It would appear that Lynn still holds to uncivilized methods of settling labor difficulties, although the State herself has pointed out a better way; and one might have hoped for some improvement, if only on the principle that "a burnt child dreads the fire."

The other three cases, which I shall take from the Massachusetts pamphlet, are given by Mr. Joseph D. Weeks of Pittsburg, and are three attempts made, at different times and places, to introduce the principle of arbitration as a means of settling labor questions in the Pennsylvania coal trade, the first in 1871 and the two last in 1879.

The conditions existing in the anthracite regions (where the first attempt was made) before 1868 are thus described by Mr. Weeks: —

"The industrial history of the anthracite regions has been marked by greatest fluctuations, in demand and prices for its product, and a most terrible catalogue of outrages connected with

labor difficulties. . . . The rapid increase in production created an unprecedented demand for labor, coupled in the seasons of demand with such inducements in the way of wages that vast bodies of workmen were attracted from other industries and other sections, and even from foreign countries, to the anthracite regions and the mining of coal. . . .

"The workmen had little in common except their occupations, and between employees and employer there seemed not the least community of interest. In the periods of over-demand, prices for labor would be forced by the men and conceded by the operators to a ruinously high figure; but the inevitable glutting of the market that followed brought wages to a point inadequate to sustain life, and a period of privation and suffering ensued. These periods of plenty and suffering that followed each other with grim regularity soon told upon the character of the workmen of this region; and a condition of society almost surpassing belief developed itself, marked by the most terrible evidences of its existence. Strikes were the normal condition of the region; and, their outcome being for the most part the constant defeat of the workingmen, a feeling of utter hopelessness and blind recklessness became the ruling spirit of many of the workmen, although it should not be forgotten that there was still a large class of miners who were as thoughtful, provident, and self-respecting as any class of citizens. . . . A writer speaking of the condition of this region during the war describes it as 'a pandemonium of outrage, violence, and anarchy, utter disregard of the sanctity of law and of immunity, through its lax enforcements, such as has never been known before in Pennsylvania and seldom in the nation.'

. . . "It was in the midst of such a condition of affairs that two Associations were formed that for years exerted a powerful influence on the employees and trade of this region.

"On the 6th of April, 1868, a petition was presented to the Court of Common Pleas of Schuylkill County, asking for a charter for the 'Workingmen's Benevolent Association of St. Clair,' which petition was granted in due course. . . . The Anthracite Board of Trade of the Schuylkill coal region was formed on Nov. 19, 1869. . . . Each party in the labor contests in this region were thus prepared with an organization that could give voice to its wishes and intentions, and could conduct any contest that should be joined."

During the next year and a half these two organizations succeeded in adjusting wages by mutual agreement,—that is, by means of conciliation; but, finally, difficulties arose which made it necessary to resort to arbitration and call in outside assistance. Arbitrators were selected by both sides, who met at Mauch Chunk April 17, 1871, and chose Judge William Elwell of Bloomsbury as umpire. The Board had been convened "to settle the difficulties then existing, but no others"; but, to the surprise of the operators, the delegates from the Luzerne and Lehigh regions refused to allow the question of wages to be submitted to the decision of the

umpire, and the men from Schuylkill introduced a new proposition. . . . These positions thus taken by the workmen resulted in the failure of the arbitration, so far as wages were concerned. . . . The operators of Schuylkill County determined to ignore the Workingmen's Benevolent Association, and appealed directly to the men (April 22, 1871). . . . This appeal was characterized in a card issued by the Association on April 27 "as grossly insulting to the legally elected officers, and as a bribe to the men"; but in the same card the Association receded from its refusal to arbitrate on wages, and, after making certain proposals in regard to the conditions of resuming work, continued: "If this offer is not agreeable to the operators, we are willing to submit the question of wages, including all propositions thus far made by either side, to arbitration." . . . After some preliminaries, on May 11 arbitration was agreed upon for Schuylkill County, the other regions having already resumed work by mutual agreement. Besides the agreement to arbitrate the special questions then at issue, the articles signed by the officers of both Associations also contained the following: "4. Provision is hereby made for future arbitration in the following manner. (1) All questions of disagreement in any district excepting wages, which cannot be settled by the parties directly interested, shall be referred to a District Board of Arbitration, to consist of three members on each side, with power, in case of disagreement, to select an umpire whose decision shall be final. No colliery or district to stop work pending such arbitration. (2) If any question arises involving the whole county, a Board of Arbitration shall be chosen, consisting of five members on each side, with the same rights and duties as for District Boards."

On May 17 the decision of the umpire was rendered, and (to quote again from Mr. Weeks) "this result was hailed throughout the entire region as a settlement of troubles for the year. Not only that, but it was believed that an era of peace had at last dawned on the troubled coal regions. . . . All these anticipations were doomed to disappointment, as the terms of the decision remained in force only until September. . . . The loaders of the Thomes Coal Company, in flagrant violation of the award of the umpire, demanded an advance, . . . and ceased work. The officers of the Workingmen's Benevolent Association used their efforts in favor of adhering [to the terms of the award]; and the difficulty was on the point of adjustment, when the company acceded to the demand, and entered into a written agreement with all their employees, including even the miners who had not asked an advance. . . . Of course, the men at the other collieries in the vicinity demanded the same agreement. It was resisted at some, and the men struck; at others, they agreed, under protest, until action was taken by the committees. . . . Appeals were made to the officers of the Workingmen's Benevolent Association and to the men to adhere to the agreement, . . . and many of them did use their exertion to maintain it, but gradually, one by one, agreed to pay

the advance; and the President of the Workingmen's Association candidly admitted that it was impossible for them to check the current, because so many had already acquiesced rather than have a strike."

Here, as is evident, the failure is due to want of faith on both sides. The men disregarded their agreement, but the Thomes Company were equally to blame for disregarding theirs.

In October, 1879, Mr. Weeks himself succeeded in securing the formation of a Board of Arbitration for the Pittsburg (Penn.) district, with members appointed by meetings of the operators and of the miners expressly called for the purpose. Mr. Weeks had, at the request of the Governor of Pennsylvania, made a visit to England in 1878 to investigate the working of conciliation and arbitration in that country, and was eminently fitted therefore to assist in drawing up practical rules for the government of the Board. The rules were indeed drawn up, and were adopted. Several meetings were held, the first session lasting five and a half days; but no agreement as to a scale of wages could be reached, and no umpire acceptable to both sides could be found who could serve, and, after two months' vain effort, the Board adjourned *sine die*. Of this failure Mr. Weeks says:—

... "The cause was that the miners' representatives did not come to the Board with full powers, as the operators' representatives did, but were bound by the instructions of the convention which appointed them. Failure is nearly, if not quite, inevitable under such circumstances. The very intent of arbitration is that the arbitrators shall come prepared to hear the arguments and facts, and decide in accordance with these, and not in accordance with the instructions of a body that have not heard the arguments nor considered all the facts. It might perhaps be said that there was a reason back of this for the failure, and that was the suspicion of the miners that would not allow them to believe their representatives would be loyal and honest to their best interests. . . . This suspicion led the miners, in opposition to the spirit of the rules, to bind their representatives with instructions. . . . Under such circumstances, failure was a foregone conclusion from the first, and always will be in similar cases."

The other attempt to form a Board of Arbitration in the coal-trade was made in the Shenango Valley at the same time as that just referred to. At the request of the operators, a conference was called on November 14, several meetings were held, and rules were adopted; but no agreement as to a scale of wages could be

reached, and the Board of Arbitration dissolved. Mr. Weeks says of this attempt:—

“Here, again, one cause of the failure seems to have been the lack of power on the part of the miners’ representatives, they having to refer the proposition of the operators to a mass convention for adoption or rejection. Another vital error, both here and at Pittsburg, was the failure to elect an umpire until the situation had reached a dead-lock.”

In both these cases, as appears, it is the miners who were in fault, because they had not in good faith accepted the conditions essential to arbitration: they had not confidence either in their own representatives or in the representatives of the operators.

The four cases which I have cited are all instances of entirely voluntary conciliation and arbitration, the two first attempts having been made twenty years ago, and the others twelve years ago. Since that time the principle of arbitration has been recognized by various State legislatures; and in New York and Massachusetts State Boards have been appointed, their duty being, when called upon by the parties to a controversy between employers and employees, to act as arbitrators, or, in their discretion, to make an inquiry into the causes which led to the trouble, and report to the legislature upon the subject.

The reports of both Boards for the year 1890 supply interesting material for my purpose,—examples, that is, of a failure to settle peaceably certain difficulties because of a lack of the necessary moral and intellectual qualities on one side or the other. I select from each report two cases.

On May 22, 1890, the cabinet-makers, carvers, and varnishers employed by a firm in New York struck because the firm refused to discharge a foreman who was objected to by the Furniture Workers’ Union. The firm brought the matter to the attention of the Association of Manufacturers of Cabinet Work and Furniture; and the Association appointed a committee to investigate the charges against the foreman, at the same time inviting the Union to appoint a committee to meet them, investigate the charges jointly with them, and settle the difficulty. After two requests to this effect, the Union appointed a committee, but gave them no power to act, and, in answer to a third request from the Association of Manufacturers, decided to continue the strike, and not to confer. The Association continued its efforts to induce the

Union to accept the principle of arbitration, but in vain ; and the strike continued until November. Here the manufacturers did all that fair-minded men could do to bring about a settlement, and to secure the adoption of a method which would have done much to prevent future trouble between them and their employees ; while the latter showed themselves arbitrary and unreasonable.

In the next case, taken also from the New York Report, the circumstances are reversed. In February, 1890, the workmen employed in the planing-mills of Buffalo began an agitation for a reduction of their hours from ten to nine ; and on March 27 the District Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners sent a letter to the officers and members of the Builders' Exchange, asking that a time be appointed when a committee could wait upon them to discuss the matter. Receiving no reply to this request, on May 5 the United Brotherhood sent a circular letter to each of the mill-owners in Buffalo, asking whether he would concede a nine-hour day if a majority of the mill-owners decided to do so. To this letter but one answer was received, which was affirmative, on the condition named ; and on the 11th of May a second circular was prepared and published, and also sent to each employer, demanding the reduced hours without reduction of pay and with extra pay for overtime. To this the answer of the employers was a resolution, published on the 19th of May, that they would not pay ten hours for nine hours' work ; and on the 20th six hundred men struck.

The Board of Mediation and Arbitration of the State met in Buffalo June 2, having requested both sides to send representatives to meet them. A committee from the employees met the Board, but the secretary of the mill-owners wrote that there was no power to appoint a committee until after the next meeting of the Board. Later, on June 4, the mill-owners sent a letter to the Board, saying they had nothing to arbitrate ; and on June 6 the strike came to an end.

Here it is the employers who show a spirit of arrogance. They refuse to reply to the perfectly courteous communications of the United Brotherhood, in order to avoid a strike ; and, after the strike is begun, they refuse to submit their side of the case to the State Board of Arbitration.

It cannot be supposed that in either of these cases the relations between the employers and the employees can be friendly. There must be a sense of irritation and of mutual dislike, which at any

time is likely to produce renewed trouble. The wonder is that men whose daily lives are so closely bound together should be willing to continue under conditions which are, at the best, those of latent war. If there is a truce, it is only while the defeated side is recruiting its powers. Each side lies on its arms and awaits the signal to join battle again.

One of the two cases selected from the Massachusetts Report is the contest of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of Boston for a shorter day. And in that city this Union showed the same intelligence and self-control which distinguished it in Buffalo; while, unfortunately, the employers (in this case the Carpenters' Builders' Association) manifested very much the same tyrannical spirit which was seen on their part there. The United Brotherhood, in order to furnish no excuse for a refusal of their demand for a shorter day, agreed to accept also reduced wages; and they invited the Master Builders' Association to a conference upon the question, and offered to submit the matter to arbitration. They were met, however, by an unconditional refusal to consider the question; and the strike was begun May 1, 1890. In June the State Board of Arbitration invited both associations to submit the matters in dispute to them, to which invitation the United Brotherhood answered that they would gladly meet a committee of the Master Carpenters; but these would not consent, and the strike ended after a second attempt on the part of the Board (on July 8) to induce the Master Carpenters to agree to arbitration. The report of the Board on this strike closes with these pregnant words:—

... "The contest was practically given up by the workmen, but with the expectation of renewing their demand at some future time and under more propitious circumstances."

The last case I shall give is remarkable because of the extreme reasonableness on one side and the unreasonableness with which it was met.

In February, 1890, a Boston firm of contractors, being unable to get as many men as they needed from the Journeymen Freestone Cutters' Union, hired marble-cutters to work on marble which was to be used in building. The Union claimed that their members had a right to do all such work; but there were no members of the Union to be had, and no new members were for the time being allowed to join. As the Union had been in the habit of imposing

on their employers other very annoying and burdensome conditions, without previous consultation with them, the latter, who belonged to an organization called the Freestone Contractors' Association of New England, decided that it was time to come to an understanding with the Union, and to formulate a set of rules by which their mutual relations should be governed. Accordingly, in response to a strike of thirty-six Union men on February 26, the Association voted to lock out all the Union men in their employ throughout New England, unless the Union should consent :—

1. That the books of the Union should always be open to admit any competent freestone cutter to membership.
2. That the rule as to apprentices should be so modified that American boys might be permitted to learn the art of carving stone.
3. That marble-cutters should be allowed to work on marble building work.

On February 28, after this action on the part of the contractors had been posted in the yards, all the Union men in Boston, about seven hundred, struck : and the result was the same in Springfield and elsewhere. On March 3 a detailed statement of their grievances and proposed terms was published by the Contractors' Association. The following extracts from the report of a Committee, which is embodied in the statement, are worthy to be reproduced, as showing the spirit which ought to control employers in all dealings with their employees :—

... "Having thus recited some of the more prominent of the improper acts of the Unions, your Committee desires to call attention to the fact that the blame for this aggravated condition of things does not rest entirely upon the workmen ; for, had the employers been wise enough several years ago to form an organization of their own, they would surely have been able to prevent many of these overt acts, and by this time have secured a more harmonious and safe relation between the workmen and themselves. The present situation is an impressive illustration of the extent to which a strongly organized body of men may override the rights of others, and, becoming arrogant through lack of organized opposition, finally produce a reaction, and seriously weaken their just claims for recognition.

"Your Committee trusts that, in the emergency which now confronts our special calling, the spirit of crushing, conquering, retaliating, may not have any place in the minds of the members of this body, but, while exhibiting a proper indignation, that we simply permit ourselves to insist upon a readjustment of our relations to

the workmen on lines which shall fairly represent the rights of all concerned, unbiassed by acts of the past. . . .

"Your Committee recommend that it be plainly stated that, in this undertaking of the Freestone Contractors' Association to establish a system for the conduct of work which shall be more just and equitable, no attempt is made to injure or destroy the Journeymen's Association or Union ; that, on the contrary, it is the wish of the contractors that the Union should grow and flourish, and, that it may so grow and flourish, the present effort is simply to prune away certain rank and noxious growth, which not only threatens the safety and prosperity of the employers as business men, but which also menaces the welfare and even life of the Unions. . . .

"Your Committee now reaches the most important part of the duty assigned to it; namely, the recommendation of a plan by and through which the reforms suggested may be achieved without ignoring the rights either of workmen or employers, and without neglecting the advantage which the existence of organizations on both sides secures. Disputes and differences are bound to occur so long as the two relations exist; and the manner of settling the present accumulations of grievances should be so just and fair that it may be used as a key to unlock all future complications.

"Your Committee recommends that a permanent Court of Arbitration be established, to which all our present grievances and all grievances of the workmen (if any such exist) be presented for settlement.

"This court to be formed of three members of the Contractors' Association and three members of the Journeymen's Association, with a seventh man as judge or arbiter, to be selected by the six first named from some profession or business in no way connected with the freestone business or any of the building trades. This arbiter to be preferably a judge of some of our higher courts in New England. This arbiter or umpire to sit in all meetings of the Committee, and to have the deciding vote when the balance of the Committee cannot agree. The umpire to be paid a proper fee for his services; the expenses to be equally divided between the two Associations interested. All findings of this Court of Arbitration on matters submitted to it to be accepted as final by both parties as Associations, and by all members of each Association as individuals." . . .

To this paper the Union published a reply, the most important part being the closing paragraph, which is as follows :—

"In reference to your proposition to submit all differences arising between us to arbitration, the Journeymen Freestone Cutters' Union is willing to arbitrate, the Board of Arbitration, however, to consist of equal numbers of employers and employees. The Union

does not believe it is wise or necessary to bring into the controversy judges or any persons who are not familiar with the business."

On March 7 and subsequently the State Board of Arbitration attempted to secure a meeting of committees from both sides; but no favorable answer could be obtained from the Union. On March 11 the Contractors' Association again presented their plan of arbitration slightly modified, in order that each of the four Unions of New England should have a representative on the proposed Board, and at the same time warned the Unions that, should no official acceptance of the proposal be received before March 17, the yards would be reopened on that day and workmen engaged without any regard to the Unions. This was what took place; and, although the Freestone Cutters' Unions asked for a conference two months later, the Executive Committee of the Contractors' Association replied that no action would be taken upon their request, and the strike was declared off by the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Union in October.

A pathetic story this, of a great opportunity wasted, thrown away. These men had every condition, except the nobility to take advantage of them, necessary for the establishment of peaceful relations forever, one might almost say, between themselves and their employers. They themselves had a long-established and very strong Union; and they had, what is almost as necessary, among their employers also a strong Union, ready to recognize theirs, though not willing to submit to tyranny from it. This Union of their employers offered to join them in establishing a Board of Arbitration upon a plan which had for twenty years worked successfully in some of the most complicated trades in England, and to submit to this Board for final settlement, not only all future grievances, but those of long standing which had given rise to the existing troubles. It is sad that men should sacrifice so much simply, as it would seem, to make a vain show of their own power.

I have selected failures instead of successes as illustrations, because they seem to me to show more clearly the qualities needed to enable men to establish peaceable methods of settling labor difficulties, by showing for lack of what qualities the failures befell. In the first case I have cited there was no real desire for justice on either side; in the second, both sides broke faith; in the third and fourth, the workingmen did not trust even

their own delegates ; in the fifth and eighth, the workingmen cared only to assert their own power, showing but little intelligence or conscience ; and, in the sixth and seventh, the employers showed the same selfish, tyrannical spirit, the same want of intelligence and conscience.

I think these cases prove that without intelligence, love of justice, faith in others, and honor on both sides, civilized methods for the settling of labor difficulties cannot be adopted.

If men use uncivilized methods, they will suffer and will cause others to suffer ; and the only way to avoid the suffering is by the development of high intelligence and noble qualities among both employers and employed. Let us hasten to recognize and do honor to these qualities wherever we meet them, and return our grateful thanks to the men who work for peace, whether they be among the Trades' Unionists, the Knights of Labor, or in the ranks of employers.

6. COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

BY HON. SEYMOUR DEXTER, OF ELMIRA, N. Y.

(Read September 3, 1891.)

In an unguarded moment, in a pleasant conversation on one of the verandas of the United States Hotel, a year ago, I promised Professor Wayland to prepare a paper for this meeting on "Compulsory Arbitration." We have endeavored to get a release from the rash promise ; but the Professor has been unrelenting in his exaction that "the bond" must be paid, and so we are here to make the payment. To treat exhaustively this theme in a single paper of proper length for this occasion is impossible. To even outline it with any completeness will require a brevity of statement ill suited to the discussion of a proposition about which men differ.

It is the high aim of jurisprudence to provide a remedy for every wrong to person and property : —

1. That the peace of the State may be assured, and
2. That the rights of individuals may be protected.

If the laws of the State provided no peaceful procedure for recovering stolen property, he that had been robbed would be justified in recovering his property by force and arms ; but, in so doing, the peace of the people would be disturbed. If no legal and peaceful remedy were provided for malicious slander or libel, the injured party would be justified in visiting violence upon the head of his false accuser, and again the peace of society would be jeopardized. With every advance made through the centuries in the complexity of the social structure, new and advanced forms of legal procedure have evolved to meet new conditions in the evolving social life. The legal forms and procedure of a purely agricultural people will not meet the requirements of a people engaged largely in manufacture and commerce. All courts in any age, and the laws under which they are formed and their procedure guided, are but instruments to secure a "Compulsory Arbitration" of disputes between or wrongs perpetrated or alleged to have been perpetrated by one individual or a combination of individuals upon another individual or combination of individuals

or upon the social body as a whole. As the density of population increases, the points of contact between the individuals multiply, and the volume of law regulating their intercourse necessarily increases. The farmer may build his house of such material as he pleases: the city dweller must build his house of such material as the building ordinances prescribe. The social life of the present age, especially during the last fifty years, has been rapidly evolving a complexity in its structure unknown to the former ages. The State in its social life (we use the words "social life" in their broadest significance) is fast becoming knit together and related in all its part, akin to the human body. The railroads of all kinds, the natural and artificial water-ways, are the circulatory system; the telegraph and telephone, the nervous system. The various results which have come to pass through the agency of steam and electricity have changed and are changing the very habits of the people, and their environment, in the struggle for existence. New questions have arisen, or old ones under new conditions, which demand careful consideration. A single illustration will add clearness to our discussion.

A little over a year ago a great strike occurred on the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad. At the command of the chosen leaders of certain labor organizations, the greater part of the employees at a given hour quit their work; and this great artery in the nation's circulatory system was for the time being paralyzed. The traveller could not continue his journey; the business man could not go forward to meet his engagement or return to his home as he had anticipated; the country dealer could not forward his merchandise as he had planned; the city merchant could not ship his goods to fill his orders; perishable freight in transit was allowed to decay; great loss in wages was entailed upon the employees; a greater loss in its earnings upon the railroad, and a much greater loss upon the public at large. The aggregation of the monetary losses caused by this strike would have maintained a Court of Arbitration for a century. In addition to these injuries to the social life, bitterness of feeling was engendered between classes of men. For self-protection, the power of the great corporation was brought into play to crush out the labor organization, while hot-headed members of the organization planned destruction of railroad property in a manner that involved at the same time destruction of human life.

This strike, with all the consequences which it involved, was a

wrong against the social life of the State. The injury done was greater than the injury of a hundred horse-stealings, a hundred burglaries or forgeries. The peace of the State was disturbed in a greater degree than ever arises except in actual war or similar strikes. We feel there can be no disagreement, then, upon the following propositions : —

1. That all “strikes” or “lockouts” which involve paralysis, partial or complete, of any part of the circulatory or nervous system of the social structure, are *wrongs* against the social life.
2. That it is desirable to prevent these wrongs by averting the recurrence of similar strikes.
3. That it is the manifest duty of the State, speaking in the name of the whole people, to avert the recurrence of such strikes, if a possible and practicable method can be devised to accomplish the desired result.

Recurring again to the particular strike mentioned, we find two forces were arrayed against each other, which must unite and work in harmony to make either available. The great corporation, with its \$150,000,000 of invested capital and its valuable franchises granted by the State, becomes valueless without its army of employees. The army of employees must earn the wages which the corporation pay, in order to live and maintain themselves and families. In their harmonious working together, the people of the State of New York are necessarily and directly concerned and interested ; and they have the moral right, and should have the legal right, to command them to work in harmony, and to further command that neither party shall voluntarily disrupt that harmonious working, under any circumstances, to the extent of paralyzing the function which the union of their forces discharges in the social structure of the State, without the individuals directly engaged in producing such disruption being guilty of high crime under the law. We assert this proposition as true and fundamental in reference to every corporation or employer and their employees, who by the union of their forces perform a function in the social life which cannot be readily and at once discharged by others without serious injury to the public at large.

Self-interest will ordinarily secure the harmonious working of these forces ; but experience proves that it will not always suffice.

In the examination of the question under consideration, other facts should stand out clearly ; namely, that the investment of this great block of capital in the railroad and its appurtenances, and

the gathering of the army of employees dependent from month to month, to a greater or less extent, for the necessities of life upon the wages paid by the managers and representatives of invested capital, are the necessary conditions for building and operating this great highway of travel and commerce.

They are new conditions arising out of evolution in the complexity of the social structure. The invested capital is owned by individuals, and controlled and managed by their chosen representatives, for gain. The motive that inspired the investment was gain: the labor that must be done to utilize the invested capital and make it profitable must be performed by individuals. The laborer receives wages; the stockholders receive dividends: both must be paid from the earnings. If you increase either wages or dividends without increasing net earnings, the other must receive a less amount. The managers and representatives in control of the invested capital receive wages for their services in salaries. The common standard by which their ability and success in the management are measured is the amount paid to the owners of invested capital in dividends. The amount of their own salaries will largely depend upon their success in earning dividends. Hence there is an apparent and actual conflict of interest between the army of laborers and the managers of the invested capital. While human nature remains selfish, the laborer will endeavor to secure the most wages for the services rendered that he can; while the corporation, or employer, will seek to have the work done at the least wages possible and have it well done. The demands of a single employee are powerless, when asking for an increase in wages or a shortening of hours of labor or protesting against a reduction in wages. Hence comes to pass the organization of all those having a common interest for their mutual protection and advantage. Through the machinery of these voluntary organizations the laborers choose their leaders and spokesmen. We know that managers and owners of invested capital have at times been oppressive in their dealings with labor. On the other hand, we know that organized labor through its chosen leaders has made demands that were unreasonable, and could not be granted without wiping out dividends and in effect surrendering the management of the invested capital to the leaders of the labor organizations.

We have in the invested capital a centralized power which may become, and at times does become, a menace to the liberty of action and spirit of independence of its employees, the fostering of

which is essential to the perpetuity of our institutions. On the other hand, we have in the compact labor organizations a centralized power of great import, which may become, and has at times become, a menace to the invested capital and its management. Disputes arise between them, feeling and passion are engendered, self-interest prejudices cool judgment and discrimination; the contention increases in intensity until a type of open war is declared, and both sides marshal their respective forces in a conflict for supremacy, with the *intent to injure*, to the extent at least of compelling the other to yield to the terms dictated, rather than to suffer the threatened injury or longer endure the injury being inflicted.

If the laborers and their leaders on the one side, and the owners of the invested capital and their managers on the other, were the only parties directly and necessarily injured in the conflict, the argument for the intervention of the State would be less cogent; but even under the latter conditions it is the policy of the State to intervene in smaller matters. We believe the sentiment of the people as a whole is strong that it is time some better method than strikes and lockouts should be devised and enforced for settling the disputes and contentions between invested capital and its management and organized labor and its leaders, when they are engaged in performing a function in the social life which cannot be suspended, even for a day, without serious public inconvenience and loss.

The machinery for voluntary arbitration has been provided, but experience proves it a failure. The next advance (and logical in its relation to existing judicial procedure) is Compulsory Arbitration,—the establishment of a court of a character fit to deal with the questions to be tried and decided therein. In creating such a court, the important questions arising for consideration are:—

1. What shall be its jurisdiction?
2. How shall it be constituted?
3. What shall be the rules of its procedure?
4. How shall its decisions be enforced?

Let us briefly consider these questions in the order named.

1. What shall be the jurisdiction of this Court of Compulsory Arbitration?

The jurisdiction of any court involves three matters:—

- (a) Territorial jurisdiction.
- (b) The subject-matters over which it exercises judicial authority.

(c) The person or persons over whom it exercises such authority.

The question of territorial jurisdiction for our present purposes may be easily disposed of by answering that its boundaries shall be the limits of the State creating the court. The subject-matter of its jurisdiction becomes more difficult of statement in definite and clear outlines. We shall be aided by the use of certain negative statements at the outset:—

1. The boundaries should not be arbitrary, based upon class or party feeling, or caprice, or the power to secure the passage of legislation.

2. The boundaries should not be illogical and out of harmony with the generally accepted notions of State intervention and supervision in the industrial as well as the other activities within the State.

3. They should not include capital and its management invested in purely private enterprises, nor the employees of the management of such capital.

Advancing to affirmative statement, we suggest:—

First. The boundaries of its jurisdiction as to subject-matter should be based upon a principle which the mass of men will comprehend when stated, and which can be clearly recognized in its application to groups of facts or phenomena widely divergent from each other in characteristics.

Second. This principle should be in harmony with the generally accepted principles controlling in the matter of State intervention or supervision in the industrial affairs of the State.

Third. It should be a scientific principle, as against a mere empirical hypothesis.

Can we find such a principle upon which to base and to guide in framing legislation that shall define the subject-matter of which this new court shall have jurisdiction? We suggest (with modesty, however) that we can.

In whatever place in the social life of the State we find industrial activity, there we necessarily find labor and capital united in such activity. Whenever we find such industrial activity upon any large scale, we of necessity find invested capital, of greater or lesser amount, with its managers in control on the one side, and the massing under this control of a greater or lesser number of employees. These industrial activities are divisible, for our purpose, into two classes; namely, those which are performing a *public* function and those which are performing a *private* function. The

\$150,000,000 of invested capital in the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, with its managers on the one side and its army of 20,000 employees on the other, are performing a *public* function in the social life of the State. The same is true of every other railroad, every street-car line, steamboat or ferry company, every telegraph and telephone company, every company for furnishing gas or electric lights, every water company. Many others can be enumerated, but these are sufficient for illustration.

On the other hand, a firm engaged in manufacturing boots and shoes, or fabrics for wear, or implements for use, it matters not what, which is manufacturing and selling its wares in competition with other firms or corporations engaged in a similar manufacture, is performing a *private* function in the social life. (It is possible that better names than "public" and "private" might be used in this classification, but none occur to me at this time.)

All the companies we have mentioned as performing a *public* function must obtain a franchise from the State, of some kind, for the transaction of their business. The right of the State to intervene and supervise the conduct of their business, within certain lines, is generally accepted and established by many statutes. The Interstate Commerce Commission is a new court, evolving out of the new conditions to which we have referred, and in harmony with the new court for which we are contending. Such lines of supervision relate to the price charged for services rendered to the public, as passenger and freight rates on railroads, fares on street-cars and ferries, price of gas, water, etc.; also, the manner of constructing the plant and appliances used in the transaction of the business.

We therefore suggest that the subject-matter of which the new court should have jurisdiction, at its formation, should be the controversies arising between invested capital and its managers organized as a corporation, having a franchise from the State or a municipal division thereof, and engaged in performing a public function in the social life of the State, on the one side, and the employees of such corporations and their chosen leaders on the other; and we further suggest the limitation of such controversies to the following subjects:—

1. Wages.
2. Hours of labor.
3. Tools and appliances used by the employee in performing his

labor, and the competency of his colaborers as related to his safety.

4. The conditions under which the employee is required to perform his labor, as related to his health.

5. The terms of the contract between the employee and the corporation, relating to the causes, the time, and the manner in which it may be terminated by the employee or the corporation.

This discussion and final statement as to subject-matters of jurisdiction has also brought out clearly the *persons* over whom the new court should exercise judicial authority; namely, the corporation engaged in the performance of a public function (recognized in judicial procedure as a *person*), its officers and managers, and the employees of such corporation or corporations and their chosen leaders. The statement of the manner in which the court shall obtain jurisdiction of the person in the exercise of its judicial authority belongs in the discussion of the Rules of Procedure of the court, to be referred to hereafter.

How shall the Court be Constituted?

This brings us to the second important question,—How shall this court be constituted? what shall be its numbers, the title of its members, how selected, and what cardinal principle shall guide in their selection? With the right kind of men in this court, we have no doubt that Compulsory Arbitration can be made successful, and a grand advance made in our jurisprudence; but, with the wrong men there, failure would certainly follow. Time will not permit us to discuss the reasons for them, but we believe each suggestion following has a valid reason to sustain it. We suggest:—

1. The membership of the court should be *seven*.

2. That the name of the court should be the New York State Commission of Compulsory Arbitration; its members being styled Commissioners and its presiding officer Chief Commissioner; their terms of office to be five years.

3. The Chief Commissioner to be appointed by the Judges of Court of Appeals, and the appointee to have been trained in the legal profession and have had at least five years' experience as a judge of a court of record in this State. The second Commissioner to be appointed by the Chancellor of the Regents of the University, the Presidents of Cornell University, of Rochester Uni-

versity, of Columbia College and Union College, who, in making such appointment, shall jointly certify that the appointee is learned in social and economic science, and in all other respects duly qualified to be a commissioner of such court. The third Commissioner to be appointed by the Governor, the fourth by the Senate, the fifth by the Assembly, the sixth to be designated by the corporations of the State which come within the jurisdiction of the court, and the seventh by the employees of such corporations through their chosen leaders.

The court shall elect its own clerk and other officers and attachés. Its headquarters to be at Albany, but with power to hold sittings at any place within the State. The Chief Commissioner, the Social Science Commissioner, and the Commissioner appointed by the Governor shall have no other business in which they are actively engaged, and be expected to devote all their ability and energy to the work of the Commission.

The decisions of the Commission shall not be subject to review by any other court except upon questions involving its jurisdiction and powers, under the laws of the State establishing and relating to the tribunal, and then by the Court of Appeals in the first instance.

What shall be the Rules of its Procedure?

Concerning the rules of procedure in this tribunal, the necessity for brevity confines us to a discussion of the important questions of such procedure. The details should conform to the established practice of our courts of civil jurisdiction. As we conceive the important questions, they may be stated as follows:—

1. Who may voluntarily become a party, and who may be compelled to become a party, to a proceeding in such court?
2. How shall the complaining party or plaintiff compel the defending party or defendant to appear in the court, and make answer to his complaint? What the form of complaining and what the form of answering?
3. When the issues are joined, in what manner shall the trial proceed?
4. How shall the decision be made and a judgment or decree entered thereon?

We suggest:—

1. That any corporation of the class above described may become a complainant or be a party defendant under its corporate

name and the names of its board of directors and the general officers of the board ; that is, in addition to the corporate name there shall also appear the names of the directors and the names of the general officers. The reason for requiring their names to appear, and for uniting them as actual parties with the corporation itself, has reference to the form of the judgment and the details of the same, which the court may finally render, and the manner of enforcing it.

2. That the employees as a whole or a majority thereof of any such corporation may become a party complainant or be made a party defendant, and shall be pleaded under the name and style of the employees of said corporation ; and that they are such employees shall appear by suitable averment in the petition presented to the court and attested by proper verification. (Of this petition we shall speak in the consideration of the second question above stated.)

3. That any particular class or grade of employees of such corporation, numbering at least twenty-five, may become a party complainant or be made a party defendant, in the same manner as above specified, in reference to the whole or a majority of the employees.

4. That any labor organization formed by and consisting wholly of the employees of such a corporation, and having in active membership at least a majority of all the employees thereof, and numbering at least twenty-five ; also any labor organization formed by and consisting wholly of any particular class or grade of employees of such a corporation, and having in active membership at least a majority of such class or grade, and numbering at least twenty-five,—may become a party complainant or be made a party defendant.

5. That any labor organization formed by and consisting wholly of the employees of two or more corporations of this class, or of any particular class or grade of such employees, with the consent of the Commission, may become a complainant or be made a defendant.

6. With the consent of the Commission, two or more corporations may unite as complainants or be united as defendants.

In this enumeration we have excluded from becoming a party any labor organization which is not formed wholly of the employees of the class of corporations which may become a party, voluntarily or by compulsion, to a proceeding in the tribunal, and

only allow a labor organization formed from the employees of two or more such corporations to become a party by the consent of the Commission. The reason for so doing is to exclude from any dispute or controversy or matter that may be brought before the court for examination all parties not directly interested therein.

In the consideration of the second question we suggest that a proceeding in the court shall be commenced by the filing of a petition in form, but a complaint in substance, wherein shall appear, *first*, the proper averment of the jurisdictional facts, and, secondly, a concise statement of the matters in dispute or controversy; and it must also appear that the petitioners and complainants have theretofore, within a reasonable time, in some suitable manner, asked the parties named as defendants to grant the matter or matters in controversy, and that they have refused so to do, and still refuse. The averments of the petition shall be properly verified under rules established by the court.

Thereupon, the court shall carefully examine the papers presented, and decide in the first instance whether the petition and accompanying papers upon their face show the necessary jurisdictional facts, and whether the alleged dispute or controversy is apparently worthy of consideration or is sham and frivolous. If they decide against the petitioners on any of these grounds, upon the face of the papers, they shall be notified and given a hearing if desired. Whenever the court decides that the case presented is a proper one to compel the defendants named to answer, the court shall forthwith cause the petition and accompanying papers to be served upon the defendants, with the process of the court, requiring them to appear in the proceedings, and file their answer, properly verified, to the averments of the petition, with such other answers or affirmative matters as properly bear upon the questions raised by the petition. When filed, the court shall forthwith cause a copy of the same to be served upon the complainants, and they shall be required to reply to any affirmative matters therein contained; and, when the issues are thus framed, the trial shall proceed under rules prescribed by the court, the same to conform as far as practicable to the ordinary rules of practice in courts of civil jurisdiction, but allowing the parties and the court all the latitude that shall be necessary to place the court in possession of all the facts, which seem to the court to be proper to take into consideration, in deciding the dispute or controversy on trial before them; both parties to have the right to the aid of experts and counsel, if

desired. It shall be the aim of the court to ascertain and determine what is just and equitable between the parties themselves, and in their joint relation to the people of the State.

The court should have the power to require the State to appear in the proceedings, if deemed necessary or advisable, by its attorney-general.

One of the most important as well as one of the most frequent questions liable to come before such a tribunal for settlement would be a controversy relating to wages. A brief statement of the manner in which the court should examine such a question seems desirable.

An issue over the question of wages may arise from an attempt to reduce wages by the corporation, and a refusal on the part of the employees to accede, or an attempt on the part of the employees to secure an advance, which the corporation refuses to make. For illustration, let us assume a case of a corporation attempting to reduce wages. Passing by the details of forming the issues, we inquire, What shall the court investigate, from the facts admitted in the pleadings, or from evidence given by witnesses examined before them?

1. The price of wages paid at the commencement of the proceedings?
2. The price of wages if the proposed reduction is made?
3. The value or purchasing power of the old wages when established, and the purchasing power of the wages if reduced to the price as proposed?
4. The reasons which the company offer for the reduction.
5. The grounds of the objections made by the employees to such reduction.
6. The price and purchasing power of wages for similar services paid by other companies that are competitors, if such an examination seems to be necessary to arrive at an intelligent and equitable decision.

A calm judicial investigation before a court, without a jury, of these and similar questions as they may arise, will do much to clear the vision of the respective parties, and educate the public and prepare them to accept and abide by the decision of the court. One of the most important results to be gained from such a trial will be the authentic information obtained upon the matters in controversy, and, through the agency of the press, daily spread through the State. This would be educational, and aid in

dispelling an ignorance which is the greatest obstacle to harmonious relations between the owners and managers of invested capital and the employees thereof.

Decision of the Court.

Time will not permit us to enter into details: these can be readily adjusted along the following lines.

In the case of a controversy over wages, the decision should grant the increase, or permit the reduction, from the date of the filing of the petition in the proceedings. The decision of the court, under the laws establishing the tribunal, should give the employee the same legal rights against the company as he would have under a contract made with it, involving the same terms as the decision prescribes.

In a proceeding to reduce wages, the complainant, having first obtained consent of the court, upon notice to the defendants, should have the right to retain from each employee the amount which the reduction proposes, during the pendency of the proceedings; the court having the power to require that the amount be set aside in a safe depository for the benefit of the employees, in case the decision shall be adverse to the complainant.

In the event "hours of labor" is the matter in controversy, the decision of the court shall fix the hours required for a day's labor, and the reasonable wages for the reduced hours; and, if the employee is required to work the longer hours, pending the investigation; and is, under the final decision of the court, entitled to extra pay therefor, the court shall so decree, and the employee shall have the same rights to recover the same as above suggested in reference to an increase in wages.

If the issue involves the tools and appliances which the employee is required to use, as related to his safety, and the final decision shall be in favor of the employees, such decision shall be conclusive proof of negligence on the part of the company, from the filing of the petition in the proceedings, in any action brought against the company by an employee or administrator thereof, for injuries received in the use of the tools and appliances. And the court shall prescribe the time within which the defects in the tools and appliances, as related to the safety of the employees, shall be remedied; and, in case of failure to remedy the same, the corporation itself shall be subject to

fine, and its board of directors and general officers shall be held to be in criminal contempt of court, and shall be dealt with individually accordingly, such proceedings in their nature giving full opportunity for any officer to show, if true, that he is not responsible in any degree for the contempt, but has done all that he could to comply with the decision of the court. Contumacious contempt of the decision of the court should involve a forfeiture of the franchises of the corporations.

We must not weary you with details in the matter of enforcing the decisions of the court. So far as invested capital and its managers are concerned, it will not be difficult, along the lines of a contempt of court and making certain contumacious acts a crime, to secure their enforcement. Among these acts we would classify the discharge of employees who became complainants in a proceeding or were successful in such proceeding. We would make it a crime for the employees to refuse to abide by the decision of the court.

With the court established, there should be a law regulating the terms of contract between the employees and the corporations, as to the manner in which the employee may terminate his service, and, on the other hand, prescribing the manner in which he may be discharged for cause.

Upon the establishment of this court, with powers conforming to the lines suggested, a "strike" or a "lockout," or acts equivalent to either, should be declared a criminal conspiracy against the peace of the State, and those engaged guilty of high crime, and punishable in any court of criminal jurisdiction; and an attempt at fomenting or inducing such acts should be held to be an attempt to commit such crime, and punishable accordingly.

Voluntary Arbitration.

In the scheme of this court voluntary arbitration should be provided for and hold a conspicuous place. By voluntary we mean a submitted case upon an agreed state of facts, the facts agreed upon, being reduced to writing and signed by the representatives of the respective parties, taking the place of the petition and answer, and accompanied by a stipulation, signed by both parties, submitting the matter in controversy to the decision of the court; with the same force and effect as though one of the parties had commenced a hostile proceeding against the other, and the court had required the defendant to come in and contest the matters at

issue. The voluntary arbitration would be in principle the same as the submission of any matters at issue, upon an agreed state of facts, in any court having authority to hear the same.

Many points in this scheme for a Court of Compulsory Arbitration are left untouched which have occurred to me in thought and study ; many objections can be raised to which there seem, to my mind, clear and simple answers. But we are compelled to omit both objections and answers in this paper. We firmly believe the time has come, in the rapidly evolving complexity of our social life, for an advance in jurisprudence along the lines suggested. We believe it practicable, and we earnestly and deeply feel it is necessary, to preserve in the future the peace and safety of the State. For the ills which we seek to curb and control in this manner there is no remedy at present but a type of war. As the Anglo-Saxon blood feud passed in the lines of heredity from father to son, and involved not alone families, but whole communities in its fatal outbursts, so shall class feuds, along the line of labor and capital, be handed down from generation to generation, with outbursts that shall again and again endanger the glory of our institutions and the fabric of our social structure, unless our jurisprudence shall evolve to meet these new problems in our social life.

7. SOCIAL INFLUENCE OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

BY GEORGE GUNTON, EDITOR OF THE "SOCIAL ECONOMIST."

(Read September 2, 1891.)

It is a characteristic of evolution that new formations always have to prove their right to exist by their power to establish themselves. This characteristic is as general in society as in the physical world. Every new institution has had to fight its way against old established forms. To this rule labor organizations have been no exception. For generations they were treated as conspiracies against society, and to be a member of one of them was made a criminal offence. Although this is greatly modified,—very few people, except in the most backward countries, now holding it, and the legal right of laborers to organize being conceded,—it is still believed by many that labor unions are unnatural, injurious, and opposed to public policy. Several of our prominent daily papers still refuse to employ Union printers. A few weeks ago the manufacturers of California formed an association for the special purpose of suppressing labor organizations throughout the State. One might as well form a society to abolish factories or to stop civilization.

Now, it is another general principle that in a progressive society there is a constant tendency to adjust institutions to the requirements of the people, by eliminating what is useless and retaining what is useful. Therefore, whenever an institution increases in extent and power, as society advances, we may be sure that it fills some important function. But labor organizations are not ancient institutions which have outlived their usefulness: they are comparatively recent developments, and are increasing in power as society advances. They are a natural part of capitalistic production and the wages system, both of which are indispensable to our complex civilization.

The development of the capitalist class, with its specialization of industry and use of large machineries, has practically divorced the laborer from nature. He cannot profitably go directly to nature for his products, as he once could. The single-handed laborer can-

tain a decent living either upon the farm or in the shop, so his products can be undersold by those of capitalistic producers. Therefore, the laborer has been led to turn to the capitalist for employment, who, in turn, has assumed the responsibility for the laborer's income. It is now the employer who deals directly with nature, and the laborers deal with him. In other words, the capitalist employer has, in the evolution of industry, come between the laborer and nature, because, with his organized capital, he can make nature yield more than the laborer could, and or both. This change, however, has made the laborer's income depend upon stipulated wages instead of the individual product, as formerly,—which, of course, puts the capitalist in the same position to the laborer that nature formerly occupied as the source of his income.

Under these changed conditions, when workmen want to increase their income, they cannot profitably go to nature with a little more energy or a few more hours' work; but they must go to the capitalist for higher wages, and, if Nature is to yield more, it is he who must make her do it,—which the adherents of Mr. George might do well to consider. This transition has also practically destroyed the productive individuality of laborers by differentiating them into specialized parts of a complex productive machine. Men can now only work successfully when employed in large masses, subdivided into numerous groups, each being complementary to the other and dependent upon it. By these changes, workmen have been welded into an economic as well as a social class, whose income is drawn from employers and tends to uniformity, according to their industry and social life. This identity of interest and independence of welfare naturally led to associated efforts among laborers, in the same way that the division of labor led to the organization of capital. Labor organizations are therefore both historical and economic accompaniments of the organization of capital, and are as inseparable from the wages system as are factories from capitalistic production.

Labor organizations first arose in England, because capitalistic production and the factory system were first established there; and they have been extended to other countries just as fast as factory methods have been adopted. Inasmuch, however, as they arose in apparent opposition to capital at first, they have been, as I said, violently opposed from many points of view, and especially by the capitalists.

One of the prominent objections urged is that these labor organizations tend to destroy the right of individual contract. Now, if combinations are so injurious to the freedom of contract, why do not capitalists avoid them? Is it not a little singular that employers should be so very jealous of the laborer's freedom and so indifferent to their own? Surely, it is a little odd that industrial organizations should be so injurious to laborers and so beneficial to capitalists. It is a peculiar fact, however, that the freedom and welfare of the laboring classes have most steadily advanced during the period when the power of labor organizations has most increased. This opposition to labor unions for the laborer's good is quite historic. In the early struggles of English laborers to secure a reduction of working time for women and children in factories,—from twelve to eleven hours per day,—the proposition was opposed by statesmen and economists on the ground that it would destroy their freedom to work as many hours as they chose; and more than forty years later the same objections were urged against a ten-hour factory law in Massachusetts. Edward Atkinson and others pleaded for the sacred right of working women to make individual contracts,—just as if factory women and children, or men either, had ever enjoyed this precious boon!

As a matter of fact, no such right has ever existed since the factory system began. It has been rendered impossible by the very nature of specialized and concentrated industry. The right of individual contract means nothing unless it means that every individual can make contracts for himself without regard to those of others. Experience has shown that such contracts are incompatible with a highly complex productive system. The subdivision of labor and interdependence of departments upon each other, the similarity of work and the necessary uniformity of product in each department, the dependence of all upon a single motive power make it necessary to treat all laborers in each branch substantially alike, as a matter of economy, of administration, and uniformity for cost of production. To the modern employer, laborers constitute various parts of a vast productive enterprise, and must work in practical uniformity or not at all. This is not only true of the laborers in a given shop, but it is practically true of laborers in different shops in the same industry, whose products compete in the same market.

Thus it is the economic conditions of production, and not labor combinations, that have destroyed the feasibility of individual con-

tracts ; and it is beyond the power of either laborers or capitalists, or both combined, to restore them without abrogating the factory system. Since both capital and labor necessarily move in large aggregations, it is manifestly as irrational as it is uneconomic for organized capital to object to the existence of organized labor. Since individual contracts are impossible, and wages in the same industry, like prices of the same commodities, must needs be practically uniform, it is clearly for the interest of the laborers that their conditions should be governed by the more intelligent of their class ; and this organization makes possible.

The truth is, no such freedom on the part of laborers to make individual contracts for themselves, different from those under which their fellow-laborers in the same shop are working, is ever intended by the much heralded phrase "freedom of contract." All that it really means is that employers should have the freedom to take laborers singly, in order to make them jointly accept their terms. In other words, it means that, in making a contract, laborers shall not have the right to be represented by the most competent of their class or craft, so that each one, however ill-informed or incompetent to present his case, shall be dealt with singly by the representative of corporate capital. Thus, while uniformity of price for the same work in the same shop prevails, this method enables the employer to impose the maximum hardship and give the minimum pay, which the superior men can endure : whereas, if the laborers acted collectively, as the capitalists do, the more competent of their number could be chosen to negotiate the contract for the whole, thus preventing the inferior from being used as a means of destroying the contracting power of the superior. And, since a contract made by the superior would always be as favorable as that made by the inferior, or more so, the poorest laborers have everything to gain and nothing to lose by associated or representative action. Any system of jurisprudence which should permit representation by counsel on one side and refuse it on the other would, throughout Christendom, be pronounced a scandalous violation of the principles of equity ; yet this relation obtains between employers and employed in the most civilized countries, except so far as it has been rendered impossible by the power of organized labor itself. As both capital and labor now necessarily move in large aggregations, it is manifestly alike irrational and uneconomic for either to object to the organization of the other, especially as the most efficient use of neither can be obtained without it.

Moreover, trades-unions are educational institutions. They tend to develop the intelligence and character of the laborers in many ways. In the first place, they stimulate the study of industrial questions, which involves a considerable amount of reading and general information, and also an intelligent acquaintance with the industrial conditions of their craft. The discussion of the various propositions which arise for consideration tends to develop individual confidence, force of character, and consciousness of industrial rights and social power in all who attend. In short, they are the economic academies of the wage-class, and constitute nearly the only opportunity for economic education laborers have ever had. Consequently, intelligent trade-unionists are frequently better informed upon industrial and political questions, and are less liable to lose their heads in a sentimental whirl, than are the more educated and less experienced middle class.

Trades-unions are also important social centres. In addition to furnishing laborers with the means of better knowledge of their economic condition, and more intelligent methods for improving them, they afford an opportunity for social intercourse otherwise practically impossible. They are to the wage-workers what clubs and other social institutions are to the wealthy. The social intercourse and activity thus created tend to awaken new interests, wants and aspirations, which are not limited to individual members, but gradually extend to home life, thus gradually improving the social condition and the standard of living of the whole class. The pressure of the increased social needs thus silently developed makes a demand for higher wages necessary. Those who first experience this kind of hardship, being the most intelligent and characterful of their class, are usually first to advocate a general demand for higher wages. And, since it is impossible, both from the nature of the factory system and the constitution of labor organizations, to make special terms for individual cases, the only way the most advanced laborers can secure an increase of wages for themselves is to obtain the same for their whole class. All this is not only educating and socializing in its influence, but, by welding the laborers into a social class, it compels the more intelligent and advanced to devote their efforts to improving the material and social condition of their less capable brethren. That is why we always find the most intelligent, most socially advanced, and best paid laborers, in every industry, the most prominent trade-unionists, and, usually, the most active social agitators.

It thus appears that trades-unions are essentially economic institutions. Instead of being inimical to the laborer's interest and a menace to capital, they are a most important feature of modern society. For the same reason that nothing can permanently reduce the price of commodities which does not diminish the cost of production, nothing can permanently advance wages which does not increase the laborer's cost of living. It is by their opportunity-creating influences, and not by their power to limit the number of laborers, that trades-unions ever permanently affect wages. Of course, they resort to strikes as a means of enforcing their demands, when petitions and other moderate forms of request have failed, because a considerable portion of the laborers are acting under the pressure of a social necessity, which, if not satisfied, will involve a protracted social conflict. It will not be disputed that strikes are often unwisely and badly managed, that dishonest men, otherwise conspicuously unfit for leadership, sometimes get to the head of labor organizations. But is this not true of every other form of social and industrial organization? Are capitalist organizations free from these charges? Do they not often act rashly, involving the disaster of innocent investors? Have they not their Warners and Wards? Cannot the same impeachment be urged with quite as much truth against political organizations and social clubs? Would any one venture to say that, because there are dishonest railroad presidents and corporation treasurers, the combination of capital should be prohibited? Why should workingmen be expected to be more honest and wise than any other class in the community? Why should perfection be demanded of them, when liability to err is conceded to everybody else? Since the other social institutions are to be judged by their virtues, why should labor organizations be judged by their mistakes? Considering their limited opportunities and the extent of the forces arrayed against them, the wonder is not that the laborers have made so many mistakes, but rather that they have succeeded at all. These mistakes are not a necessary part of labor organizations any more than dishonest ministers are a necessary part of Christianity. On the contrary, they arise from ignorance and mistaken notions among the laborers, which trades-unions are the most efficient means of correcting. Hence we find to-day that in those industries where trades unions are best organized, and exercise the greatest influence, strikes are fewest, wages are highest, hours of labor are shortest, and the relation between

workers and employers most confidential and harmonious. Trades-unions, therefore, are not only legitimate economic and social institutions, but they are an integral part of the industrial organization of modern society. They are the most economic counterpart of that combination of capital whose existence and development are equally necessary to harmonious social advancement.

It is simple folly, therefore, to regard trades-unions as necessarily a menace to industry and social welfare: they are constitutionally important educational institutions, and can never be a power for other than good through the discipline they must encounter. Since labor organizations are the most effectual and nearly the only means of furnishing opportunities for economic education to the wage-workers, instead of trying to degrade and suppress them, it is alike the interest and duty of both the employing class and the community to encourage their development and increase their usefulness.

8. RELATION OF TRADES-UNIONS TO APPRENTICES.

BY PROF. E. W. BEMIS, OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
NASHVILLE, TENN.

As one of the chief causes of opposition to trades-unions is their supposed influence in limiting the number of apprentices, it is important to investigate the question. Such previous studies of the subject as have come to the writer's notice are to be found in the reports of the bureaus of labor statistics in a few of our States.*

The principal addition which the writer would make to these bureau reports is drawn from the replies of 48 of the 50 or 60 trades-unions in this country having a national or international organization, and from personal interviews with such labor union leaders as Messrs. Strasser, Gompers, McGuire, and McNeil.

Before giving the result of such inquiries, it may be well to say a word of the change in apprenticeship brought about by modern changes in industry. The whole tendency of modern business methods towards the destruction of the entire apprenticeship system is proving too strong to be resisted. Trades become more and more subdivided. It becomes unprofitable for an employer to teach all parts of a business to a workman; while the latter, in view of the frequent changes in machinery and in business methods, stands more in need of general intelligence and manual dexterity than of a minute knowledge of each of the fifty or more subdivisions of an industry. Professor W. T. Harris once remarked, "Whereas formerly it required seven years to learn a trade, now one must be able to learn a new occupation in seven weeks." Yet in some lines of work, such as the glass-working, iron-moulding, printing, and building trades, there is not now, and is not likely soon to be, enough subdivision and use of machinery to render special training unnecessary. Apprenticeship has until recently been considered by all to be the only means of securing this practical skill. It is in this gradually lessening number of trades, where apprenticeship is still practicable and necessary for good workmanship, unless trade-schools can accomplish the same end,

* Notably, New York, 1886, New Jersey, 1887, California, 1887-88, Wisconsin, 1887-88, Ohio, 1878, 1884, Missouri, 1888, Connecticut, 1890, and in the forthcoming report for 1891 of the New Jersey Bureau, wherein apprenticeship in the glass-blowers' trade is treated.

that some of our American trades-unions demand a thorough apprenticeship. In connection with rules which require that the apprentice must spend a certain number of years, usually three or four (instead of seven as of old), in learning his trade, and which aim to protect both employer and apprentice during this time, our unions in some cases have other rules which restrict the proportion of apprentices to journeymen in each shop. It is this latter class of rules that have brought so much odium on labor organizations. What are the facts?

Of the 50 to 60 trades-unions in the United States having a national or international organization, 48, with a membership of over 500,000, have made returns to the writer. Most of the other unions are small or known to place no restrictions on apprentices. Of this 500,000, embracing the great body of organized labor in this country, outside of the Knights of Labor, only about 83,000 men in 17 unions, or 16 1-2 per cent. of all, report any rules in the national body restricting apprentices; and only 71,000 men in 14 unions, or 14 per cent. of the 500,000, report success in the execution of their rules on the subject. The other 3 unions report comparative failure. It is well known that outside of a very few trades the Knights of Labor, in number 100,000 to 200,000, place no restriction on apprentices. Restriction is left to the locals in 10 of the trades-unions, with about 197,000 members, or 39 per cent., and is either not attempted, or, if attempted, is often not carried out in all those locals. 21 unions, with over 222,000 members, or nearly 45 per cent., report that they have no restrictions whatever. These 21, together with their membership, are presented in Table I.

TABLE I.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Membership.</i>
International Furniture Workers' Union of America	Not reported
United Mine-workers of America	40,000
International Brotherhood of Boiler-makers and Iron Ship Builders	8,000
National Federation of Silk-workers	1,107
Locomotive Engineers	30,000
Boot and Shoe Workers' International Union	14,000
Granite Cutters' National Union (about)	15,000
Locomotive Firemen	22,000
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen	20,000
Switchmen's Mutual Aid Association of North America	11,500
Glass Employees' Association of America	450
Waiters' and Bar-tenders' National Union	Not reported
Building Laborers' Hod-carriers' Union	" "
Order of Railway Conductors	16,000
Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers *	27,000
Amalgamated Society of Engineers, Machinists, Millwrights, Smiths, and Pattern-makers (about)	2,000
National Federation of Silk-workers	No report
Cotton Mule Spinners of Fall River	800
Axe and Edge-tool Makers' National Union of America	No report
Amalgamated Society of Engineers (in United States about)	2,000
Journemen Bakers' National Union	12,000
Total (about)	<u>221,867</u>

*The Boston branch has 1,800 members.

It will be noticed that 100,000, or nearly half of the above, are railway employees, and 40,000 are mine-workers, where apprenticeship is impracticable. The secretary of the Glass Employees' Association of America, Mr. L. J. Fegan, writes from Pittsburg:—

We have no restrictions other than that we require apprentices in piece-work establishments to receive the same price as journeymen. While the latter provision does no injustice to the employees, they not having to pay for work not performed, nevertheless it protects the workers to the extent that employers would prefer competent workers in preference to beginners. . . . If there are no restrictions, and the practice of putting in apprentices is customary, it has a tendency to reduce wages. When there are two or three men for one job, then the competition for positions becomes acute, and workers from necessity are compelled to accept any pay offered. In one branch of the packing industry in glass works (owing to lack of organization) it is a rare thing to see a man over thirty-five years of age. Young people are preferred, owing to their working cheaper and their superior activity. Young men learn the business, and about the time they have a family dependent on them they are compelled to seek other employment for a livelihood.

We begin to see why so many trades-unions restrict the number of apprentices.

The 10 unions, with about 200,000 men, which abandon all regulation of apprentices to locals, are given in Table II.

<i>Name of Union.</i>	TABLE II.	<i>Membership.</i>
Drillers' and Quarrymen's Union		4,200
International Machinists' Union of America.....		1,000
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.....		83,000
International Typographical Union.....		27,800
Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners		35,000
Cigar-makers' International Union of America		24,624
Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators of America.....		15,000
Sheet-iron and Cornice Workers' International Association.....		3,000
Journeymen Stone-cutters' Association		3,000
International Brotherhood of Machinery Moulders of North America		
Total *		<u>196,624</u>

Only those branches of the cigar-makers' organization which make the better grade of cigars attempt any restriction at all of apprentices. Where restriction is attempted, it is usual to allow one apprentice to a shop, and two apprentices where from five to ten journeymen are employed. The term of apprenticeship being only three years, and the natural working life of cigar-makers over

* In 1888 the Bricklayers' and Masons' International Union (16,000 members) had rules placing them under this table. No later report has been received. This would make the total over 210,000.

fifteen years, there is in the application of this rule opportunity for a considerable yearly increase in the number of cigar-makers.

Of the 11 local Typographical Unions in New York State, investigated in 1886 by the New York Bureau of Labor Statistics, 8 reported some restriction of apprentices. The very moderate rule common to most of these was one apprentice to four or five journeymen, the term of learning being four years. But such rules are of comparatively little avail in keeping down the number of printers because of the large number trained in the country newspaper offices, where, in the absence of unions, no rules are applied. All the eleven unions, as stated in this report, admitted to their membership, on equal terms with any others, those boys that had learned their trade in non-union establishments.

The machinists seem to place no restriction upon apprentices; but the secretary of their union, Mr. Morse of Brooklyn, writes:—

Personally, I must say that I very much deplore the present system in most of our large machine shops throughout the country. For instance, a boy goes into one of these large shops to serve an apprenticeship of three years. He goes in with the understanding, in many cases, that at the end of that time he will be a finished mechanic, able to command the wages of such. Instead of dealing fairly with the boy and giving him a chance to get the first rudiments of the trade he has chosen,—for that is all I claim any boy does get during his apprenticeship, be his chance ever so good,—he is put at some machine or bench, as the case may be, and kept there for three years. Now, sir, I ask you, as an intelligent man, what on earth is that boy good for? Can we wonder at the number of tramp machinists—for that is what we call them in the trade—going about this country? It is a deplorable condition for our trade to be sinking into. Now, the remedy for this, to my mind, lies in the thorough organization of our trade. I do think there should be restrictions and rules regulating apprentices, and stringent ones, too. I am quite sure that our International Union will take up this matter at our next convention.

The Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators, with 15,000 members, has no national rules on apprenticeship, but recommends to the locals to secure the indenturing of apprentices for four years, and to limit the number as soon as each local union may see fit. But these recommendations are little heeded. The general secretary, Mr. J. F. Elliott, writes from Baltimore:—

We desire to have an apprentice law that will re-establish the indenturing of apprentices and the turning out of skilled tradesmen; but the tendencies of the times point to a different condi-

tion, and the trade-school is gaining favor all over. Wherever our locals are strong enough, we enforce our laws and endeavor to make the indenturing of apprentices the rule, but so far have met with poor success. I notice that the bosses are beginning to find that the rapid introducing into the market of a vast number of unskilled painters is affecting their interests, and that this element, not being able to hold positions as journeymen, opens up independent shops and takes work under any condition,—a matter which seriously affects the interests of the bosses.

Each local of the Sheet-iron and Cornice Workers' Union has its own rule, or absence of rule, on apprentices. The Pittsburg, Pa., district now allows one apprentice every four years to three journeymen instead of to four, as formerly.

In Table III. are given the three national unions that have some rules limiting the number of apprentices, but, according to their secretaries, fail to enforce them.

TABLE III.	
<i>Name of Union.</i>	<i>Membership.</i>
Saddle and Harness Makers of America.....	1,500
Hat-makers' National Association of the United States.....	2,994
Shoe-lastors' Union.....	7,850
Total	<u>12,344</u>

The Hat-makers' National Association reports almost total failure in the enforcement of any limitation upon apprentices. The Shoe-lastors' Union has a stringent rule that "no branch of the organization shall give permission to or allow any of its members to instruct, teach, or in any way aid any person or persons in learning to last; except in case a member of said branch wishes his son to learn to last, which wish may be granted by said branch, should said branch conclude so to do. If said wish is granted, it shall then be lawful for any member of said branch to teach said son to last, if for good and sufficient reasons the father of said son is personally unable so to do." But, in justifying this rule as a necessary "protection against a surplus of labor in the trade," the secretary, Mr. Edward L. Daly of Boston, remarks that "the manufacturers teach more apprentices than their business requires." This remark, and facts of the shoe business known in a general way to the writer from frequent visits to the shoe towns of Massachusetts, lead him to believe that the rules of the Shoe-lastors' Union keep few, if any, who so desire from learning the trade. The Massachusetts census of 1885, the most complete census ever taken in any part of this country, reports 6,032 shoe-lastors in

Massachusetts and only one apprentice,— a sufficient proof of the break-down of the restrictions of the Shoe-lastors' Union, for of course hundreds enter the trade yearly without formal apprenticeship.

The National Association of Saddle and Harness Makers of America report very poor success in enforcing their rule of one apprentice to a shop, one to the first six journeymen, and one to every ten additional journeymen. The secretary, Mr. George Joscelyn of Boston, makes the following valuable observations :—

In the East and North we have no such thing as apprentices at all. The system largely prevails in the South and portions of the West, but, as practised, is of no practical benefit to the boys, as far as acquiring skill in the business is concerned, and is an injury to the trade at large, by reason of the fact that, as soon as the boys get where they ought to have more pay for the work done, they are dropped, and a new boy taken on to go through the same routine. Thus an army of unskilled boys is turned loose every year who must live, and will work for any wage offered that will enable them to do so. The worst system that I know of prevails in the city of Baltimore. A boy is put to work in charge of another boy, and works three years. Then he in turn is given from three to five more boys to instruct; and, as each completes his servitude, he takes up the rôle of instructor in his turn. The pay starts at \$3.50 to \$4 per week, and increases 50 cents each six months to the end of the three years, when it stops,— a request for more wages after that always resulting in a discharge.

When you realize that, with good advantages to learn, it takes a man not less than ten years to become a good general workman in the harness trade,— and many men do not acquire first-class skill even in that time,— the folly and injustice of the system are apparent. From a knowledge of the business gained by thirty-three years' experience I consider our restrictions as liberal; and, if strictly followed out, they would be a benefit to the boy who wished to learn and to the trade at large.

In Table IV. are given the membership and ratio allowed of apprentices to journeymen of those unions that claim to be quite successful in their efforts at restriction.

TABLE IV.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Membership.</i>	<i>Length of Apprenticeship.</i>	<i>Ratio of Apprentices to Journeymen.</i>
American Flint Glass Workers' Union	7,300	4 years	1 to 4 or 5 or 7, according to the local union.
Bottle-blowers (Eastern division)	2,200	3 to 5 years	1 new apprentice each year to shop of 9 journeymen. If over 9 journeymen, 1 apprentice each year to every 15.

TABLE IV.—*Continued.*

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Membership.</i>	<i>Length of Apprenticeship.</i>	<i>Ratio of Apprentices to Journeymen.</i>
International Trade Association of Hat-finishers of America	4,154	3 years	1 to a department, except the "finishing."
Table-knife Grinders' Union.....	323		None but members' sons, and apparently not all of them.
German American Typographia (about)	1,100	4 years	1 to an office and 1 extra to every 6 journeymen.
Pattern-makers' Union	2,500	4 years	1 to 4, but not over 4 to a shop.
Iron-moulders' Union (about).....	28,000	4 years	1 to a shop and 1 extra for every 8 journeymen.
Hat-makers' Protective Union of Philadelphia.....			No particulars given.
Amalgamated Association of Elastic Web-finishers	228		1 apprentice to 10 looms in England, but in U.S. immigrants and sons of workmen supply the trade.
Tack-makers' Union..	212		Members can train only their own sons by vote of union.
Horse-collar Makers' Union.....	2,000	3 years	1 to a shop, or 1 to 7 journeymen, and not over 3 to a shop.
Journeymen Tailors' Union.....	20,000	4 to 5 years	1 apprentice to 1 journeyman.
National Silk and Fur Hat Trimmers' Trade Association of America.....	663	4 years	1 to 10, or 1 to a shop.
International Wood-carvers' Association of North America...	1,400	3 years	1 to 5, but only 3 to a shop.
Wool Hat Finishers' Association of the United States.....	600 (in 1889)	3 years	1 to a shop, or 1 to 10.

Although some of the rules seem quite restrictive, there are not nearly as many apprentices as even these rules would permit. In Massachusetts, for example, in the hat business there are 226 technically known as hatters and 29 apprentices. But there are 875 other hat-makers, such as silk and fur hat makers, finishers, trimmers, pressers, etc., and only three apprentices instead of fully thirty times that number, as the union rules allow. In this as in nearly every case, we find that the death-blow to apprenticeship is not struck by the unions, but by the employers, and by conditions of business which bring workers into a trade without any regular training or apprenticeship whatever. Similarly there were in Massachusetts, according to the census of 1885, only 16 apprentices to 769 journeymen pattern-makers, 1 to 48; 58 apprentices

to 2,997 iron-moulders, or 1 to 51.7; and 16 apprentices to 408 wood-carvers, or 1 to 25.5. There were 133 apprentices to 1,624 journeymen tailors, or 1 to 12, and 455 apprentices to 4,116 printers and compositors, or 1 to 9. So that, outside the two last, there were not, by a large number, so many apprentices as the union rules allow. The Eastern and Western divisions of the glass-blowers united in 1890 as an assembly of the Knights of Labor, and after long and severe contests have secured from most of their employers the ratio of one new apprentice each year to fifteen journeymen. As the term of apprenticeship lasts five years, there are, then, five apprentices to fifteen journeymen, which will double the number of journeymen every twenty years, despite the natural number of deaths.

It will be noticed that few returns appear from the building trades, due chiefly to the fact that many of these have only local and not national organization. A few of these are included in the report on apprentices of the California Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1887-88. The following from the report sufficiently summarizes it, and emphasizes the fact already brought out that comparatively few trades-unions make any pretence of restricting apprenticeship:—

The following table shows that, out of 48 trade organizations, only 14, or less than one-third, have rules or regulations relating to apprentices or limiting their number. The bricklayers' is the first of these on the list. They limit the number to two apprentices to each master mason or employer, no matter how many mechanics he may have in his employ; and they must be the sons of bricklayers. Another rule they have is that "the right of any person to take an apprentice, except a master mason, will not be recognized by this association." Under this rule, it would appear that a journeyman bricklayer is not allowed to teach his trade to his own son, unless he could be one of the two allowed to the master mason who employs him. The caulkers' rule is still more stringent, as they allow only one to each employer. The cigar-makers limit the number to 1 to each shop, and 1 to 10 men; the glass-blowers, 1 to 15 men; the pattern-makers, 1 to 4; the iron-moulders, 1 to each shop, and 1 to 8 men; the coopers, 1 son to each member; the tailors, 1 to each member, regardless of relationship. The hatters allow 2 in every shop, and the stone-cutters the same number in every yard; and wood-carvers, 1 to a shop, and 2 if 6 or more men are employed.

In view of the common belief that the building trades are successful in limiting the number of apprentices, it is very significant

to note the facts of the Massachusetts census as collated by the writer in Table No. V.

TABLE V.

<i>Name of Trade.</i>	<i>Number of Journey-men.</i>	<i>Number of Apprentices.</i>	<i>Ratio of Apprentices to Journeymen.</i>
Blacksmiths.....	5,550	196	1 to 28.3
Carpenters.....	21,042	340	1 to 62
Machinists.....	15,761	788	1 to 20
Masons.....	6,205	69	1 to 105
Painters (about).....	10,000	119	1 to 89
Plumbers.....	1,787	397	1 to 44
Printers.....	8,824	455	1 to 19
Tinsmiths.....	1,822	112	1 to 16
All others in manufacturing and mechanical industries.....	323,603	3,212	1 to 101

In the report for 1886 of the New York Bureau of Labor Statistics, 28 unions, organized with 64 local branches, were investigated. Only 8 unions, through 17 local branches, had any restriction on the number of apprentices. In New Jersey, according to the Labor Bureau Report for 1887, 59 out of 150 trades-unions "regulated," but by no means in all cases restricted, the number of apprentices. Often only the time and manner of training are regulated. Likewise 27 out of 178 local assemblies of the Knights of Labor regulated apprenticeship. A member of the New Jersey Bureau, Mr. Joseph Fischer, writes (under date of Sept. 21, 1891) that, aside from the glass-blowers, there has been no new development in the direction of apprenticeship during the last few years, "probably due to the fact that little progress has been made in organization. While trades-unions remain about the same numerically, the Knights of Labor order has very materially decreased in membership. A very pessimistic view seems to pervade workmen circles just now. I hear it frequently stated that in a few years, owing to the development of machinery, there will be no such thing as a skilled trade."

As a final proof that the trades-unions are losing interest to a great degree in the restriction of apprentices, reference may be made to the small number of strikes for this purpose. In 1881 to 1886 inclusive, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1886, there were 22,304 strikes, and of these only 250, or 1.1 per cent., had any connection with apprentices. 63 of these were unsuccessful. Of these 250 strikes, 157 were in the building trades, 28 in glass, 15 in tobacco, 12 in clothing, 9 in metals, 7 in printing and publishing. Of the 9,384 strikes in New York 1885-89, as reported by the New York Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1889, only 114, or 1.2 per cent., were connected with apprenticeships.

Of these 114, only 9, or 7.9 per cent., were successful, and 9 were partly so, while 47.1 per cent. of all strikes were successful, and 15.3 per cent. partly so.

An investigator previously quoted, Mr. Fischer of the New Jersey Bureau of Labor Statistics, truly writes: "As far as my observation extends,—and labor leaders are never tired of asserting it,—the only advocates practically of apprenticeship are the trades-unions, even though their reasons for doing so may be selfish, [said reasons being] the restriction or limitation to the number of journeymen."

The attempt of trades-unions in England to limit apprentices seems to be even feebler than in this country. That acknowledged authority, Mr. George Howell, thus concludes a thorough discussion of the English situation in his "Conflicts of Labor and Capital": "(1) The manifold rules and regulations of trades-unions do not materially interfere with the free admission of apprentices into the several trades of the country. (2) No dearth of workmen is caused in any of these trades by their restrictive action. (3) Apprenticeship is absolutely necessary for the purpose of acquiring a practical knowledge of a trade. Without this there can be no real guarantee for good and effective workmanship."

It is in this gradually lessening number of trades, where apprenticeship is still practicable and necessary for good workmanship, such as glass-working, iron-moulding, printing, hat-making, and some of the building trades, that some of our American trades-unions demand a thorough apprenticeship. This is in every way commendable. In connection with rules which require that the apprentice must spend a certain number of years, usually three or four, in learning his trade, and which protect both the employer and the apprentice during this time, our unions in some cases, as already noticed, have other rules restricting the proportion of apprentices to journeymen in each shop. Thus the Horse-collar Makers' National Union allows one apprentice at least to every shop, and one to every seven journeymen, but not over three to a shop. Apprentices serve three years. Sufficient examples have been given in the preceding pages.

The general reasons for restriction of the number of apprentices are two,—to secure a thorough training of those who do try to learn, and to keep up or raise wages by limiting the supply of skilled workers in a given trade. The first reason has much force. If an employer can take as many apprentices as he chooses, he will often fill his shop with half-trained boys, and discharge higher-

priced adults. Such action is demoralizing in many ways. Only half-trained men would ever be produced by this process.

As for the very few unions which go farther and restrict the number of apprentices beyond the point necessary to secure good training, probably no full defence can be offered; but there is much more excuse for this position than is commonly supposed. The workman is only imitating the trust and combination of capital, now so common for restricting output, and with more excuse; for the laborer is in more need of improvement of condition than the capitalist.

As long as there are idle competent workmen in a trade who are willing to work, as is said to be the case in the few very restrictive unions, it is natural to desire to prevent the bringing of others into the trade. The New York Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1886 found that there were then 3,710 apprentices and helpers to 7,599 journeymen printers in 1,255 establishments outside of the large city dailies. "The totals," says the report, "furnish reasons for the unions' attitude in regard to the limitation of apprentices, and make it easier to understand the deep-seated prejudice against the unrestricted employment of boy labor." When a trade is in an overcrowded condition, it might be better in the end for even the would-be apprentice to enter some of the many new industries constantly rising with increasing wealth and wants. This will be no great hardship, for the children of workers in a trade often prefer another occupation.

I am told by a Philadelphia builder, and by Mr. McGuire of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, that by organization and limitation of apprenticeship and admission to the union the bricklayers of Philadelphia have raised their wages within a few years from \$1.75 to \$3.50 a day. Mr. Hotchkiss, Labor Commissioner of Connecticut, tells us how by similar means the employees of a certain organized industry in his State keep their wages at \$3 and \$3.50 a day, when wages for work of similar difficulty in unorganized industries are only \$1.00 to \$1.25, without appreciable increase in the price of the finished product. Many students of business conditions hold that nearly, if not quite, as many adults find employment in a trade where wages are high and apprenticeship regulated as where wages are low and any number of helpers are employed. Workmen cannot be expected to wait until the ideally best mode of raising wages is possible. They clutch at the first means offered. Trades-unionists are fond of saying that the professional classes

are not in a position to throw stones in this matter ; for they limit competition by raising the standard of admission to the bar, medicine, etc. To raise the standard of admission to a trade is declared impracticable, save in a partial degree, through apprenticeship rules. Limitation of number is the only very efficient restriction. But, whatever be the motives of many advocates of higher conditions for admission to the bar, the public would never sanction these conditions save as they produce better men.

Again, the habit of restriction is likely to lead workmen to realize the need of greatly restricting the immigration of those of a low standard of living,—a measure which nearly all American economists believe is of vital importance in elevating American labor.

Finally, we come to a brief consideration of the best way of securing that skilled labor which the apprenticeship system, through no fault of the unions, now fails to give. The only way seems to be through manual training in the public schools, followed by special trade instruction in private or possibly publicly endowed trade-schools. The folly of relying on apprenticeship, even if that were possible, was illustrated in returns from 362 workmen, in over 40 kinds of mechanical and manufacturing industries, published in the Wisconsin Labor Bureau Report for 1887-88. Only 130 report that their employers give sufficient encouragement to the apprentices in their employ, while 232 report a failure of the employers in this matter. A similar failure on the part of employees is also there reported.

As an interesting illustration of how a trade-school may help to solve the problem of trade instruction, the following quotation is made from the address of Colonel Auchmuty a year ago before the American Social Science Association. He said :—

We will take the plumbing trade, one of the most difficult of trades, and one which might more appropriately be called a profession, so varied is the knowledge and so great is the intelligence required. The plumber must know how to work with lead, iron, copper, and brass, and must understand the properties of these metals. He must know, for instance, that lead and iron pipe will not hold together ; and, to make a tight connection, a ring or "ferule" of brass must be inserted. In dealing with lead, he must be able to work sheet-lead in different forms and join two sheets together either with solder or, where a receptacle for acids is wanted, by a process called "lead burning." He must be able to join lengths of lead pipe by what are called "wipe joints." These joints are not easy to make. Let some "handy man" take a

cushion in one hand, leaving two fingers loose, lest they may press too heavily on the joint, and hold in the other a ladle of molten solder, and proceed to join two pieces of pipe. He will find he has undertaken a difficult task. Then remember that these joints are made in all sorts of places,—on the wall, near the floor, close to the ceiling,—also that there are complicated branch joints, and the difficulty of learning how to make them will not seem less. Lead pipe, too, must be bent in various shapes so neatly that the bore is not reduced nor the pipe split. The plumber must also know how to join lengths of cast-iron pipe by “caulking” or by “rust joints,” according to the purpose for which it is to be used; and he must know how to cut, thread, and bend brass and wrought-iron pipe. Yet all this work can be “listed” under fifteen heads, as follows: 1. Lead seams; 2. Overcast joints; 3. Cup joints; 4, 5. Traps; 6. Horizontal branch joints; 7. Upright wipe joints on pipe placed at various angles; 8. Upright branch joints; 9. Wiping on a stop-cock; 10. Wiping a flange on a two-inch pipe; 11. Wiping on a ferule; 12. Caulking; 13. Putting in an overflow pipe in a safe waste; 14. Cutting and threading wrought-iron pipe; 15. Bending pipe. At the conclusion of this course, fancy work is done by the more proficient.

When each of these fifteen exercises can be done well, the pupil is ready, so far as his manual skill is concerned, to put up fixtures; that is, to set and connect bath-tubs, sinks, etc., with supply and waste pipes. But manual skill is only a portion of the qualifications the plumber must possess. Besides being able to join these fixtures and his pipes, he must know how to place them. He is dealing with steam which may scatter destruction and with gases that contain the germ of disease. Common sense would also tell us that this knowledge can be taught better and more surely in a trade-school than it can be learned by observation and experience in a workshop.

The claim of Colonel Auchmuty, as of another teacher of similar work, President James H. Smart of Purdue University, given in 1888 before the National Convention of the Bureaus of Labor Statistics, is that a few months at a trade-school, followed by a few months' experience in actual work, will give any one of 18 or 19 years of age a better training than a four years' apprenticeship. In Colonel Auchmuty's School on First Avenue, between 67th and 68th Streets, New York, there were, in 1890-91, 589 pupils in bricklaying, plastering, plumbing, carpentry, house, sign, and fresco painting, stone-cutting, blacksmith's work, and tailoring. This school has now been running ten years, at a net cost, above tuition fees, of several thousand dollars a year. The Pratt Institute in Brooklyn had 51 day pupils and 201 evening pupils in 1890-91 in its department of mechanic arts opened in February, 1888

where instruction was given in mechanic arts, carpentry, turning and pattern-making, forging, machine work, bricklaying, plastering, plumbing, house and fresco painting. The trade-school of the Philadelphia Builders' Exchange was opened in 1890 with 129 pupils, of which 61 were in the plumbing department, 31 in bricklaying, and 21 in carpentry. The school graduated 63 in June, 1891, as follows: plastering, 3; painting, 2; stone-cutting, 3; blacksmith's work, 4; carpentry, 14; plumbing, 27; bricklaying, 9.

The Rindge School lately presented to Cambridge, Mass., and the Williamson Trade-school in Philadelphia, endowed with over \$2,000,000, are to be trade-schools, as distinct from manual training schools, where simply general dexterity and education of the whole being through training of the eye and hand are attempted. For thirty years Messrs. Hoe, of printing-press fame in New York, who employ 250 boys, mostly sons of their workmen, have had a night school for them. Then there is the Technical School of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company at Baltimore, an account of which is given in the report of Dr. W. T. Barnard on "Technical Education in Industrial Pursuits." A similar school is said to be maintained by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company at Altoona, Penn. The Master Plumbers' Association of Philadelphia, Chicago, and Washington, support plumbing schools in their respective cities. The number and success of technical and trade-schools in Europe are well known. A tanners' chemical school is to be established at Newark, N.J., by the Morocco Manufacturing Association. Just as all our States support professional schools for farmers, and some States in the West do the same for lawyers and engineers, so our States may be called on ultimately to support trade-schools for mechanics. The movement towards industrial schools is evidently on the eve of great growth. What is to be the attitude of our trades-unions towards such schools?

The unions are becoming more and more friendly to manual training, but seem to be somewhat suspicious of trade-schools, as likely to lower wages by increase of competition. Yet the opposition is not so great as commonly supposed, and is rapidly changing to support. Undoubtedly, Colonel Auchmuty's school has been much opposed; but it may have been partly due to a faulty method, on his part, of advertising the school as a means of dispensing with high-priced labor. He denies that he has ever thus presented his work; but in the *Century* for January, 1889, he thus

wrote: "Living is made dearer, the poor are made poorer, by union rules. In nearly all callings where skilled labor is required, it can safely be asserted that a journeyman receiving \$4 a day and working with a trade-school graduate at \$2 a day could produce as much as two journeymen now do for \$8,— a saving in cost of \$2, or 25 per cent." No wonder that the unionist opposes any such effort to benefit the employer, or the consumer, at the expense of wages. Furthermore, it is sound economic policy for the worker to prefer high wages to sharing, as only part consumer of his products, in the cheapness that might result from lower wages. But it is not likely that a general extension of trade-school instruction would in the long run lower wages. Rather, by imparting greater intelligence and skill to the wage-worker, would such schools the better prepare the way for strong trades-unions and increased productiveness.

That this is probable, and that the working classes will indorse manual training when rightly presented to them, is the belief of such able and well-informed labor leaders as Messrs. Powderly, Gompers, and McGuire. The following associated press despatch confirmatory of the above strikes my eye as this goes to press:—

Boston, September 23. An understanding in relation to trade-schools has been arrived at by the Master Builders' Association and the Bricklayers' Union. It is the first instance in the history of the labor movement in New England that a trades-union and an organization of employees have agreed upon this question. Trade-schools are to be established and opened evenings. All regular indentured apprentices are to be given instruction therein. None but regular apprentices shall be allowed to enter these schools. All pupils shall be given instruction in the theory and science of the trade they propose to learn.

Mr. W. H. Rand, of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, informs the writer that he believes the reason why European trades-unions now favor trade-schools, as they in fact almost universally do, while in America the majority as yet oppose them or do not actively favor them, is that in Europe the trade-school sessions are usually held at night and attended mostly by journeymen and regular apprentices. This seems to be the idea of the Boston arrangement just noted. As soon as our trade-schools cease to have the flavor among laborers of a capitalistic effort to reduce wages, and assume their rightful place as a means of effecting that very elevation of skill and thorough training which the apprentice-

ship laws now in vain urged by the workingmen are designed to accomplish, a great popular support will come to the schools.

As an illustration of the present attitude of the English trades-unions, we may refer to the resolution of the British Trade-union Congress in 1886, which strongly indorsed technical education and trade-schools. The views of this Congress deserve quotation :

It has been proved that Germany has sometimes beaten us in neutral markets from this cause alone. If a certain section of politicians would devote their time to advocating the establishment of technical schools for teaching the sons of our people those subjects which have to do directly with their various trades instead of denouncing the foreigner and setting people against each other, they would do far more service to the State. We have no greater friend than knowledge and no more bitter enemy than ignorance. In order to hold our own with the nations of the world, we must have the same facilities, to obtain for our children and young men both elementary and technical knowledge.

Representatives of these British unions, notably Mr. T. C. Barnes, general secretary of the Glass-makers' Association of the United Kingdom, and George Shipton of the Amalgamated Society of House Decorators and Painters of the London Trade Council, advocated before a recent Parliament Committee even compulsory instruction of boys in their trade by trade-schools. Representatives of trade-schools rendered similar testimony to the friendship of the unions. Also in the United States 72 replies, representing 10 trades, expressed in 1886 to the New York Bureau of Labor Statistics a favorable inclination towards technical trade-schools: 37 replies, representing 13 trades, opposed them. In view of the newness of trade-schools in 1889, and the mistakes and weakness naturally resulting from youth, these replies were most encouraging.

To sum up, we have found no need of any scare lest our trades-unions unduly restrict apprenticeship, for very many of the unions do not restrict at all; and, when they do, there are not usually anywhere near so many apprentices as the union rules allow. We have also concluded that technical trade-schools may do a vast deal of good in replacing, so far as the times require, the old-fashioned and now defunct system of apprenticeship, and that the unions are likely, if the manual and trade-school movement is judiciously handled, to come gradually to the approval of these schools.

In the debate on Professor Bemis's paper, further remarks were made concerning the trade-school of Colonel Auchmuty, who was not present to reply. The following letter from him is therefore printed here, in justice to him: —

LENOX, MASS., Sept. 9, 1891.

JOHN H. FINLEY, Esq.:

Dear Sir,— You ask in your favor of the 4th, just received, if the effect of trade-schools is to diminish wages, and if I claim the lowering of wages to be an object for the existence of my schools. In reply, I would say that the assertion that I am trying to reduce wages has often been made by labor leaders. The reduction of wages is neither the object nor the result of trade-school instruction, nor have I ever heard that it was. When young men graduate from the New York trade-schools, they are not capable, as a rule, of doing a full day's work. They can do as good work as the average journeymen, but they cannot work as fast. Consequently, they must get work as "improvers," to use a trade term. While serving their time, usually a few months, as improvers, they are not entitled to full wages; but I find that they often command higher wages than young men who are finishing a four years' course in a workshop, because they can do better and more trained work. So well is this fact known that from one to two hundred young men, who have been from two to three years in workshops, come to the evening classes of the New York trade-schools each winter.

The only money gift the New York trade-schools have ever received was a check for twenty-five dollars some eight years ago. I do not write this complainingly, as I have made it known that I do not desire subscriptions; and I would have returned the check, had it not been sent in a peculiarly kind way. The trade-schools have received presents of plumbing appliances, models, etc., and have had invaluable aid from master and journeymen mechanics, but no money. The tailoring class is managed and supported by the merchant tailors: I give the space occupied rent free.

The charge that I maintain the trade-schools to get low-priced labor is a very old one. Of the 3,000 young men who have attended the schools, I have, perhaps, given employment to 200, their time averaging about three months each. My circular states that, after learning how work should be done, a short term of service at real work is necessary to gain experience and speed of workmanship. The problem which confronts New Yorkers is how to get that term. Young men from country towns are free to take work where they can find it; but in the large cities the trade-unions make it difficult for my young men to obtain employment, and in some cases drive them from the workshops. To help these young men gain the needed practice, I have, as already stated, given employment to about 200, paying them wages based on what they could do. I do not find that I have got work as cheaply as I could have had it done by contract; but I can say that it was better done than any contract work I have ever succeeded in get-

ting. The work of these young men also refuted another charge : that a trade could not be taught at a trade-school.

I find that in country towns my graduates often get higher than the average wages. In the cities, as you know, the unions have established one rate for workmen, whether good or bad. I advise the city-bred young men, when they graduate, to apply for admission to the unions, and, if successful, to endeavor to influence them for good. If refused admission or if persecuted, I advise them to take work wherever they can get it and on such terms as they can get, remembering that they have a right to work in the land of their birth, even if the trade-unions, composed, as they are, mostly of foreigners, deny that right.

I would like to add one word more. I believe it of vital importance to this nation that the trades should be recruited from our own countrymen, and that they should be open to well-educated, well-brought-up young men. Such young men have remained too long at school or are unfitted by their surroundings to do the drudgery required for the first two years from the workshop lad. They have, however, been quick to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the New York trade-schools, and have come in steadily increasing numbers from every part of the United States and Canada. If labor is ever to be made honorable, it will be by bringing well-educated young men into the trades.

(Signed)

Sincerely yours,

R. T. AUCHMUTY.

The debate on these Labor Organization Papers, though important, was not reported, and cannot here be given. The Paper of Judge Dexter was read in the Jurisprudence Department.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWENTY-THREE.—Business and Debates of 1887. Address of the President: Problems of the Census—Carroll D. Wright. I. Papers of the Social Economy Department: 1. Address of the Chairman—F. B. Sanborn. 2. Profit Sharing as a Method of Remunerating Labor—F. J. Kingsbury. 3. Alfred Dolge and his Experiments—A. Dolge and Ernest Richard. 4. Profit Sharing Historically and Theoretically Considered—G. M. Powell. 5. Labor Organizations—J. G. Brooks. 6. Woman and the Temperance Question—Frances E. Willard. II. Papers of the Jurisprudence Department: 1. The American System of Trial by Jury—D. H. Chamberlain. 2. The Law's Uncertainty—Thomas Thatcher. 3. The Incurable—Francis Wayland. 4. Private Corporations and the State—H. A. James. 5. Social Science in the Law of Moses—H. L. Wayland.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWENTY-FOUR.—Introductory. Committee on Provident Institutions. Constitution, List of Members, etc. I. Papers of the Health Department: 1. Relation of the Physician to the Community, and of the Community to the Physician—Grace Peckham, M.D. 2. The Function of the Lungs—D. Emery Holman, M.D. 3. Certain Injurious Influences of City Life and their Removal—Walter B. Platt, M.D. 4. The Criminal Type—William Noyes, M.D. 5. Immigration and Nervous Diseases—C. L. Dana, M.D., with Discussion. II. Papers of the Education Department: 1. The Opportunities of America—F. B. Sanborn. 2. Address—T. W. Higginson. 3. Pedagogy in American Colleges—Professor E. J. James. 4. The Education of Women—Arthur Gilman.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWENTY-FIVE.—General Meeting of 1888. President Adams on Higher Education. I. The Growth and Purposes of Bureaus of Statistics of Labor—Address of the President, Carroll D. Wright. II. Papers and Debates of the Department of Health: 1. Address on Requirements for a Medical Degree—Dr. H. H. Curtis. 2. How Far can Legislation aid in Maintaining a Proper Standard of Medical Education?—W. A. Perring-ton. 3. The Value of a Liberal Education Antecedent to the Study of Medicine—Sylvester F. Scovel. Remarks of Dr. Grace Peckham. 4. Unsanitary Conditions in Country Homes—Dr. Lucy M. Hall. 5. The Working-women of New York: Their Health and Occupations—Elizabeth Stow Brown, M.D. 6. The Struggle for Subsistence: How can it be most Efficiently Aided?—Henry Dwight Chapin, M.D. III. Papers of the Finance and Social Economy Departments: 1. Address of the Chairman—F. B. Sanborn. 2. Savings Banks in the United States—John P. Townsend. 3. Co-operative Building Associations. Report of the Special Committee. 4. Report on Savings Banks and Building Associations of Illinois—Professor J. W. Jenks. 5. Co-operative Building and Loan Associations in the State of New York—Seymour Dexter, Esq. 6. The Dangerous Side of Building Associations—Mr. C. F. Southard. 7. Notes on Provident Institutions in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Texas—Professor Robert T. Hill. 8. Life Insurance—Report of the Committee. Hebrew Provident Institutions. 9. The Early History of School Savings Banks in the United States—J. H. Thiry.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWENTY-SIX.—General Meeting of 1889. Report of J. P. Townsend, Secretary. Constitution, List of Members and Publications, etc. I. Papers of the Jurisprudence Department: 1. The Economic Law of Monopoly—President E. B. Andrews. 2. Constitutional Guarantees of the Right of Property—George Hoadly. 3. Education as a Cure for Crime—S. T. Dutton. 4. Immigration and Crime—W. M. F. Round. 5. The Dead Hand—Dr. H. L. Wayland. II. Papers of the Education Department: 1. Industrial Training of the Defective Classes. Discussion by President Gallaudet, General Brinkerhoff, Dr. Bryce, F. B. Sanborn, Miss Alice Cooke, etc. 2. Popular Fallacies concerning the Insane—Dr. Pliny Earle. III. Papers of the Social Economy Department: 1. Report on Co-operative Building and Loan Associations. 2. Socialism in England—Percival Chubb.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWENTY-SEVEN.—General Meeting of 1890. Constitution, List of Members, etc. The Third Estate of the South—Rev. A. D. Mayo. The Single Tax Debate—Remarks by Samuel B. Clarke, Professor Thomas Davidson, W. L. Garrison, Professor John B. Clark, President E. B. Andrews, Professor E. R. A. Seligman, Louis F. Post, Edward Atkinson, Henry George, Professor W. T. Harris, and James K. Carret.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER TWENTY-EIGHT.—General Meeting of 1891. M. Levasseur on Malthus. The Late Rufus King. President White's Addresses. I. Papers of the Social Economy Department: 1. Labor Organizations—S. M. Hotchkiss. 2. Trades-unions—S. Gompers. 3. Trades-unions and Wages—Prof. J. W. Jenks. 4. Shoemaking in Connecticut—F. J. Kingsbury. 5. Arbitration, Voluntary and Compulsory—Mrs. C. R. Lowell. 6. Compulsory Arbitration—Seymour Dexter. 7. Social Side of Unions—George Gunion. 8. Trades-unions and Apprentices—E. W. Bemis. II. Miscellaneous Papers: 1. Treatment of Hydrophobia—Dr. Paul Gibier. 2. The Silver Question—J. D. Warner. 3. Reform of the Civil Service—W. D. Foulke.

19 separate pamphlets: The Single Tax Debate, 1890, and Discussion of Labor Organizations, 1891.

Sold by DAMRELL & UPHAM, Boston; G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, New York; and by

F. B. SANBORN, *Secretary*,

CONCORD, MASS.

